The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXVIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1921 NUMBER 353

Contents

The Week 28

Editorials

Peace With Germany..... 30
The Need of Publicity During the Washington Conference 32
Economic Forces in the Packing Industry..... 34
The Open Door for Raw Materials..... 35

General Articles

How Labor Could Control.....A. A. Berle, Jr. 37
The Dilemma of France.....Sisley Huddleston 39
The Farmer Corporate.....Walter Locke 42
The Wilderness of Suburbia....Lewis Mumford 44
As a Fired Man Thinks.....A. J. Taylor 46

Correspondence 47

Reviews of Books

Back to Victoria.....Francis Hackett 50
Mythical Science.....Morris R. Cohen 51
A Social Bibliography.....Leo Wolman 52
Fifty One-Act Plays....Edward Hale Bierstadt 53

The Week

THE easiest time to be attentive to people is on their birthdays. So it is that the administration chooses the week before Labor Day to announce its concern with the plight of the six million unemployed, and the calling of a conference between itself, capital and labor to see what can be done about them. But indeed, with the best will in the world, there is nothing very substantial that the administration could do for the unemployed. The country—or that part of it which is not yet seriously worrying about its bread and butter, and which is quite adequately represented by the government—is in no mood to consent to a sufficient relief of unemployment by government aid. This Day of Labor is fated to be a gray one.

MINGO COUNTY, West Virginia, is celebrating Labor Day in its own fashion—one that recalls the customs of frontier days. An army of miners —and in that mountain region everybody, including the miners, is more intimate with guns than in other parts of the country is considered modern —started to march on a district which had the reputation of admitting no union miners within its limits. To those who would urge upon them that such a threat was no way to accomplish the unionization they are after, the miners would reply that in their 1830 section of West Virginia they had learned to believe, from the example of coal operators who employ private gunmen and pay a county $32,700 a year to help it maintain deputy sheriffs, that the best answer to violence is violence. And this they will continue to believe until the coal operators themselves have been reduced to a state of civilization.

MR. McADOO'S letter on the Railroad Relief Bill upholds the view in opposition to President Harding that the government is not legally or morally bound to repay in cash the cost of additions and betterments undertaken during its period of control. The legal question would seem to be settled by his quotations from the Federal Control Act approved March 21, 1918, wherein it was required that in every contract between the government and a railroad it should be stipulated that

> "the United States may, by deductions from the just compensation (rental to be paid the railroads), or by other proper means and charges, be reimbursed for the cost of any additions, repairs, renewals and betterments to such property (railroad property) not justly chargeable to the United States."

It is the moral obligation however which is urged by our correspondents in this issue who criticize Mr. Garrett's position in his article published August 10th. To their contention that the railroads would not have made such capital expenditures or at least not have made them without preliminary financing, Mr. McAdoo replies:

> "These expenditures were not forced upon the railroads. The railroads needed them and were glad to have the Government lend them the money at 6 per cent, which was less than the market rate."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. McAdoo fully upholds Mr. Garrett's contention that Congress intended that the obligations of government and railroads should be set off against each other, and "only any remaining indebtedness of the carriers to the United States" should be refunded. Any moral obligation to give preferential treatment to the claims of the railroads must depend on some peculiar circumstances in favor of such claims. In view of the history of the relations between the government and the railroads we are bound to say that such difference does not appear.

THE Sacco-Vanzetti case, like the Mooney case, and like the Dreyfus case, is one which challenges public opinion. It is to the eternal honor of France that the appeal to the great final court of the people resulted in the righting of a signal injustice. It is the shame of California and of America that Mooney lies in prison when the evidence on which he was convicted has been proved to be perjury. In view of these contrary results, due to an aroused and enlightened public opinion on one hand, and an apathetic, prejudiced one on the other, we regard as most untimely the action of the Police Commissioner of Boston in revoking a permit from the Mayor's office for a parade and mass meeting in aid of the Sacco-Vanzetti defense fund.

THE Superintendent of Police, Michael Crowley, in opposing the order for the parade and meeting, put the relation of violence versus free speech in flawless form for future generations of liberty loving Boston to read.

> "Those defendants had a fair trial. I read the newspapers and I know. If we permitted a parade it might lead to disorder—to violent attack."
>
> "Who do you suppose would attack it?" he was asked.
>
> "I haven't anybody in particular in mind," said Crowley, "but there are public-spirited citizens, believers in good government, people who have confidence in our courts, who might resent the criticism of the courts that such a parade would imply."
>
> "You characterize those hypothetical people as believers in good government," one of the visitors commented. "Actually, if they attack such parades, they are lawless."
>
> "Well, yes," the superintendent grudgingly admitted, "they are—in a sense."

THE American Friend's Service Committee, which in the last thirteen months has spent about a million dollars for relief in Russia, appeals for five millions more. The extent of the help which the Friends have already given to starving Russia is not sufficiently recognized, and the same can be said of the strict impartiality in matters of politics of this unimpeachably humanitarian organization. Those who have already given through the Friends will be glad to learn that they will continue to work independently: they will not be merged in the American Relief Administration, nor are they to be bound by the conditions of the A. R. A.'s agreement with the Soviet government. The Friends have territory assigned to them in Russia where, unlike the A. R. A., they will feed adults as well as children. Contributions should be sent to 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia.

THE difficulty which the Conference will experience in bringing home to Japan the enormity of her proceedings in North China is considerably increased by Great Britain's dealings in the South. In our columns on July 6th Mr. John Dewey gave an account of the Cassell coal concession in the province of Kwangtung, a concession granted by military carpetbaggers from the neighboring province of Kwangsi who were later driven out. The contract signed by these usurpers gave the British company control of the coal in all the districts along the only railway lines in the province. The British syndicate's ten million dollar capital was to be divided thus: half the shares unreservedly for the directors, three millions more to be allotted by the directors at their discretion, and of the remaining two millions one to be paid to the provincial government and the other to form a trust fund the dividends of which—if any—were to be for the benefit of the province. It is easy to see that Kwangtung will reap small profit from an arrangement which is classic in its exemplification of the methods of commercial imperialism.

OF course, you will say, the British government repudiated this contract and called the promoters sharply to account when its attention was directed to the matter. It did not. Replying to a question in the House of Commons, Mr. Harmsworth, the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, said that the British Government had applied to the Chinese government for a formal ratification of the agreement. He insisted that the concession was not monopolistic—which would be true did not the districts involved lie along the only existing or projected railroads. He said that there had been no marked opposition to the agreement, when he ought to have known that a congress of British Chambers of Commerce held in Shanghai went on record in favor of abolishing the whole principle of special nationalistic concessions, of which the Cassell contract is a glaring example. The im-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pression persists that the Foreign Office instead of aligning itself with the best British trading elements in China has given countenance and support to the worst.

IN these days when race riots and Dearborn Independents are emphasizing race antagonisms it is a pleasure to hear of the quiet and unobstrusive work of such a cooperative organization in the field of race relationships as the National Urban League. The League establishes joint committees of white and colored people who meet together and work out their common community problems, —health, housing, recreation, employment and a better understanding. In Chicago after the disastrous riot in 1919 it was the Chicago branch of this organization which was the center of readjustment. The patriotic service of building such bridges of understanding between the whites and our increasingly sensitive colored citizens is of the first importance and should have the support it deserves. With its branches in over thirty cities the National Urban League is a force for peace and constructive development in the essential though difficult task of learning to live together.

Peace with Germany

THE document which the State Department describes as a Treaty with Germany, consists of a quotation from the Congressional Resolution, approved by the President July 2nd and two articles translating this resolution into terms of the Treaty of Versailles, with the reservation of certain rights and the disavowal of certain obligations under that treaty on the part of the United States. It is thus an affair of shears and paste pot, and one might wonder why two such mountains as Dr. Rosen and Secretary Hughes should have been so long in labor to achieve so simple a result.

The "treaty" undoubtedly represents the mood in which the country as a whole emerged from the adventures of the war and the Paris Conference. The opponents of the Treaty of Versailles included two groups of bitter enders. One group was opposed to that treaty because it fell short of securing the objects for which we ostensibly went into the war, and particularly because it constituted a shameful violation of the terms on which Germany surrendered. This group was sustained by a conviction that refusal to ratify the Treaty of Versailles would exempt the United States from moral responsibility for that instrument, and would perhaps result in a revision of it in the interests both of honor and of practicability. This group can obviously derive no immediate satisfaction from the present document. It recognizes the Treaty of Versailles as fundamental; and so far as the peculiar interests of this country are concerned, accepts it. The betrayal of Germany to which the United States was a party at the Paris Conference is reaffirmed. The moral issue is hopelessly lost. The other group was opposed to the Treaty of Versailles on the basis of the provisions by which the United States was committed to its enforcement. Their opposition was expressed in narrow and nationalistic formulae, with an occasional flash of moral indignation, and it rested on thoroughly selfish grounds. They resisted the contention of the large number of liberals who urged the acceptance of the treaty in order to reform it; and in view of the events of the past two years, these children of this world have proved wiser in their generation than the children of light. To them the present treaty with Germany is a full diplomatic triumph, and a worthy result of our success in arms. Their exultation finds voice in Senator McCumber's comment: "I am very favorably impressed with the treaty, especially the provisions which reserve our rights under the Versailles treaty, which Germany has ratified without our having to ratify it ourselves or without our having to be bound by it."

It is too late to express disappointment at this lame and impotent conclusion of the greatest and most costly national enterprise undertaken by the United States in its history, but it is not too late to re-examine the situation in which the country has placed itself, and consider the logical consequences in which that situation should eventuate. The fundamental fact is that the United States is at peace. In this respect it is on a different footing from a large part of the rest of the world. The damning indictment of the Treaty of Versailles is that it did not make peace. The fact of the score of intermittent wars that have flared up in the burnt area of the great conflict is patent; and no one can say that in the past two years France and Germany have been at peace. From this complex of hostility the United States has declared its freedom. It is in a position either to enjoy that freedom with emphasis on self-interest as the main chance, or to use it generously and constructively to retrieve the mistakes which were palpably made, to win back something of the confidence of the world which it gained by its proclamation of sacrifice and lost by faintness of heart and confusion of purpose. And that such an obligation rests on the United States, not only as a matter of self-interest but of honor, we unhesitatingly assert.

It is an opinion often expressed that America owes nothing to Europe. In the view of the Amer-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ican, the history of the last seven years reveals three distinct and honest attempts to aid that distracted continent: first, by neutrality and disinterested advice ranging from Mr. Wilson's peace without victory speech to Mr. Ford's pilgrimage; second, by generous interposition by force of arms on the side that seemed to be attacked and injured; and third by the promulgation of a thesis which contained the secret of peace and healing, and an honest attempt to secure its acceptance. What the European sees and the American does not see is first, that our neutrality was not altogether impartial or disinterested. From almost the beginning of the war we were a decisive factor therein. Had we acted promptly either by accepting the challenge of the invasion of Belgium or by enforcing the rights of neutral trade our action must have brought the war to a conclusion long before the economic structure of Europe was shattered. And secondly the European realizes and the American does not, that our interposition by arms was brought about at the very time when both parties to the contest were on the point of taking our advice as to peace without victory. On this point serious thinkers like Mr. Lowes Dickinson and frivolous spectators like Colonel Repington are agreed, and the former makes it the basis of his claim of American responsibility to Europe. Just as by an early decision we should have shortened the war, so by a tardy one we prolonged it for a fatal year and a half. And finally the average American fails to take account of our responsibility for the miscarriage at Paris. The legend persists that we offered the nations a gospel of reconciliation, an ideal plan of world settlement, and they would have none of it. In fact some of the worst blunders of the settlement, such as the careless partition of the Austrian state, were the fruits of the bungling ineptitude of our representatives; the final decision as to the impossible and dishonorable bill for reparations seems to lie squarely at Mr. Wilson's door; and the strength of America's declared idealism was steadily undermined by a malignant propaganda in which we enjoyed the luxury of a hate which we are now forgetting.

It is these considerations which give weight to Mr. Lowes Dickinson's S. O. S. to America in a recent number of the Atlantic Monthly, and the moving plea of Professor Viallate at the Williams College Conference. They appeal not to our pity but to our justice. And it is with explicit reference to our obligations to Germany that the same plea is voiced by Ex-Premier Nitti:

> "America, having in definite form contributed to victory, cannot stand aside disinterestedly now. Guarantees given to vanquished peoples are even more sacred than those given to a victor."

It is the present treaty with Germany which gives the United States its first and most immediate opportunity for remedial and constructive action in Europe. That treaty is hardly more than an outline of reservations to be filled in later by negotiation of the terms on which the relations of Germany and America are to be developed. It is possible to maintain those reservations in their strict sense, to bleed Germany to the uttermost limit of the concessions which she was compelled to grant at Versailles, or to accord such treatment as Germany undoubtedly thought herself entitled to expect according to the terms of the pre-armistice agreement. The specifications of the present document have reference to rights of property seized in this country by operations of the Alien Property Custodian. It has been pointed out that such seizures were in violation of previous treaties with Prussia, and of certain propositions in international law governing the seizure of property of belligerents, to which the United States had formally given its support at the Hague Conference. The way of generosity in this matter is charted for us by precedents of our own making.

Further, it has been a standing argument against a separate treaty with Germany that the latter is not in a position to make agreements with the United States for mutual advantage. She is not a sovereign state. To quote from an illuminating statement by Professor James W. Garner:

> "The United States government might be entirely willing to enter a treaty with Germany on more favorable terms than those accorded to Germany by the treaty of Versailles, but insofar as the new treaty would conflict with the treaty of Versailles it would not be legal unless the allied and associated powers were willing to release Germany from her obligations. This they are not likely to do."

This immediate difficulty in our international position, between Germany and the Allies, may be discovered to be an advantage. If the relations which the United States desires to establish with Germany are not merely for the exclusive benefit of the two powers, but to the interest of the world—as they should be—the United States can properly approach the signatories of the Treaty of Versailles with a request for such modifications in that instrument as are necessary to the existence of such relations. In this way, the whole economic situation may be brought under consideration and made a subject of amelioration. The most pressing suggestion of Professor Viallate at the Williams Conference was for such removal of economic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

barriers as would permit trade among nations to resume its healing flow through the arteries of the world, rectifying exchange, discharging obligations, carrying surplus products from "prosperous" countries to undernourished peoples. At the same conference Mr. Norman H. Davis urged the establishment of credits on the part of the United States by investments in foreign countries needing this stimulus to production. Undoubtedly Germany is one of the most natural fields for such investment, apart from the stringent terms of the mortgage in which she is now held, but she is not the only nation needing credit and promising return. A tolerable readjustment of the terms of the German mortgage might be made a part of a general scheme of international credits. In any such envisagement of the economic rehabilitation of the world, the indemnity of Germany to the Allies, and their debts to the United States must be always in the background, and the cancelling out of such impossible obligations might become feasible in the light of considerations affecting so strongly and so vitally the recovery of civilization. A disposition on the part of the United States to deal honestly and generously with Germany could not be without influence on the public opinion of other nations; the resources to appeal powerfully to their self-interest, indeed their instinct for self-preservation are in our hands. Once more it would seem as if the possibilities and responsibiiities of leadership were ours. The opportunity and the question are before us. The answer is in the use which we make of peace with Germany.

The Need of Publicity During the Washington Conference

THE administration has decided, so we gather from the Washington dispatches, to hold the Disarmament Conference behind closed doors. It qualifies the news by assuring to the American public an accurate and complete daily account of the transactions and proceedings; but this account will not be a literal transcript. It has to be edited. While the State Department has not officially and formally announced the decision, the intimations from Washington all point towards the exclusion of the press.

Those who dislike, as we do, the idea of a closed conference should take care to understand and do justice to the motives which prompted the decision. The most plausible argument in its favor would run something as follows. The Conference, particularly in its handling of the problem of the Pacific, will deal with a group of ambiguous, delicate, unstable and dangerous international relationships. Its handling of these questions needs to be both conciliatory and candid. But the public official discussion of questions which arouse fierce passions and whose disposition involves the welfare of millions, makes it difficult to combine a conciliatory spirit and a successful result with the desirable amount of candor. Diplomats distrust the behavior of public opinion during the process of a delicate and critical negotiation. It is in public that candor often degenerates into indiscretion. A frank revelation of the policy of their own government or of their objections to the policies of other governments might start a ferment in the press which would render any final agreement much more difficult. Popular opinion with respect to questions of international policy is both ignorant and inflammable. Unless it is soothed and managed, it is likely to get out of hand and create an atmosphere of public recrimination which will prevent the more conciliatory and manageable processes of diplomacy from reaching a formula of agreement.

The argument possesses force. The tendency of public opinion in a democracy to lose coolness and self-possession in the discussion of vital questions of foreign policy sufficiently explains why foreign policy has usually escaped popular control. But the argument disregards one important consideration. Public opinion is ignorant and inflammable about questions of foreign policy chiefly because diplomats have conducted the foreign affairs of their countries in secret and have allowed only ambiguous and garbled versions of what was actually taking place to reach the public eye. They are doubtless more candid with one another than they are with the public, but this candor results in fruitful discussion only within narrow limits. It has been part of their business to keep the strong box of Foreign Offices well stocked with suspicions and to harbor injurious designs against other countries which they did not care to reveal. They rarely dared to be candid about matters of large importance. Bismarck took advantage of this atmosphere of deception to use frankness as a device with which to fool his diplomatic opponents. As they could not believe that he was telling the truth he frequently tempted them to double cross themselves. Considering the history and the usual outcome of diplomatic negotiations during the nineteenth century it is credulously optimistic to expect a sufficiently frank ventilation of differences among nations to take place in secret. There is an intimate connection between secrecy and deception and between candor and publicity.

We trust consequently that in the end the ad-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ministration will permit the publication of the actual proceedings of the Conference. It is a risk, undoubtedly, for a published transcript of the actual proceedings will furnish weapons to the demagogues in this country and Japan and in Great Britain who want to provoke dissensions and precipitate wars. But it is a risk worth taking. Public opinion in the British self-governing dominions, in the United Kingdom and in this country needs and longs to be fully informed about the political questions raised by the Pacific Conference. Its instability, credulity, suspicion and inflammability are chiefly the product of ignorance; and if the negotiations remain secret and the reports of them are edited for the purpose of concealing disagreeable facts, it will continue to be suspicious, unstable, ignorant and inflammable. The American government has always advertised its preference for the public discussion of international differences. If it fails to live up to its boast in arranging for the first great international conference on American soil, it will repeat with less excuse Mr. Wilson's mistake in Paris. It will pay for the privilege of entering into more intimate and responsible diplomatic relations with other nations by the surrender of a precious, intrinsically valuable and immediately available national tradition.

The Conference is more likely to be a success from the American point of view if its proceedings are published without being edited. The chief object which the American government seeks to promote by calling the Conference and by asking for a special consideration of the problem of pacifying the Pacific will tend to be defeated by even partial secrecy and to be promoted by full publicity. That object can be summed up in the phrase "America wants to know." Her own policy at least in the Pacific is inoffensive, unambiguous, disinterested and frank. She claims the right to decide for herself whom she will allow to settle on American soil and whom she will not allow. She seeks to preserve the territorial and political integrity of China and to prevent any one nation from obtaining a privileged economic position in that country. She believes that if the principles which underlie these policies are accepted by the other Pacific powers, there is no reason why the navies in the waters of the Pacific could not be reduced to the dimensions of police forces. If they are not to be reduced, she wants to know why.

It is the prevailing belief in this country that the aggressive policy of the Japanese government in China makes necessarily for the maintenance and the increase of armaments in the Pacific. The Japanese government denies the charge. It claims, as the German government claimed in 1914, that its armaments are primarily defensive. If the American charge is justified, it should be possible in the event of an open conference to convince the public opinion of the world of its truth. But a closed conference, the report of whose proceedings was edited, could not convince public opinion of anything. People would not trust it. The Japanese government could conceal its policy, as it has done consistently and successfully in the past, behind a screen of ambiguous phrases and promises.

Japanese diplomacy has won more success than the diplomacy of any other power in deceiving the world about the nature of its ambitions. Its formulas have always been immaculately inoffensive; its actual behavior ruthlessly aggressive. During the years in which its immediate objective was the conquest of Korea, it signed several treaties with the Korean government which guaranteed the independence and territorial integrity of that country. Yet when the fruit was ripe it was not satisfied even with a protectorate but insisted upon annexing Korea and abolishing every vestige of her independence. So it is with China. One of the clauses in the Anglo-Japanese Alliance guarantees the independence and territorial integrity of China. Yet during the twenty years of the existence of that Alliance Japanese political and economic influence has become dominant in northeastern China. In one way or another Japan has obtained a special position in Manchuria, Mongolia and Shantung, which places any government established in Peking at her mercy. During the latter part of the same period she has deliberately undermined Chinese political integrity by alternately cajoling, bribing or bullying the government of the republic into politically disintegrating behavior. Her policy in China is a larger and more adroit version of her policy in Korea; and if allowed a free hand it will effect at least a considerable part of the same result. In the past the Anglo-Japanese Alliance has operated to give it a free hand. That is the reason why American public opinion will regard the renewal of that alliance with profound suspicion and dislike.

If the Japanese government continues with the connivance of the British Foreign Office to carry on its attacks on the independence and integrity of China, there can be no peace and no disarmament in the Pacific. Assuming the correctness of the American contentions, the Pacific Conference will not succeed unless it convinces the public opinion of the world of the relation between Japanese aggressive policy and Japanese armaments, and the necessity of abandoning the policy as a condition of reducing the armaments. Once public opinion

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is thoroughly informed and convinced, Japan will not, we believe, hold out for long. She does not occupy a sufficiently secure physical and moral position to justify her in isolating herself and in incurring the condemnation of a consensus of opinion in the great maritime countries. She originated her prevailing policy during a period in which France, Germany, Russia and Great Britain all were contending unscrupulously for privileges and concessions in China. One by one they have all been forced to suspend the policy of encroachment, leaving Japan almost alone in its attitude; but in the meantime the world has changed. There now exists a much truer and more general realization of the fatal results of such aggression in China and of the necessity of cutting out the physical and moral expense of continuing it. Japan may be reluctant to recognize the change, but in the end she will have to do so. The Conference in Washington, if it is managed with a view to the large ultimate success rather than to any petty immediate gain, will serve to bring this necessity home to Japanese public opinion.

Economic Forces in the Packing Industry

OF the many promises made by the Republican party in the last presidential election, none was more vociferously hailed than the promise to business of immunity from the iniquities of public control. Business, big and little, waited impatiently until March 4, 1921, for freedom from inquisitorial investigations, from the obligation of answering official questionnaires, and from the submission generally to bureaucratic meddling. With characteristic American consistency the administration began promptly to redeem its promises. And so, within considerably less than a year, it revives the War Finance Corporation, extends aid to farmers, occupies itself on a large scale with the railroad business, meddles in shipping, contemplates widespread statistical inquiries, shows an inclination to investigate the coal industry, and enacts legislation providing for the control of the packing industry. Mild control; but still control.

Nowhere can it be seen more clearly than in the packing industry why the government has been forced into this policy in spite of professions to the contrary made, no doubt, in all sincerity. The packing industry is typical of those great American industries which have passed through the various stages of business organization, from the highly competitive to the well-integrated, monopolistic or, perhaps, cooperative. This progression arises originally from the desire to avoid the instability and irregularities of purely competitive enterprise. But no sooner is the result accomplished than the temptation to use economic and industrial power seems, in the common run of cases, to become well-nigh irresistible. The integrated industry, therefore, becomes monopolistic, not only in form, but also in practice, and those who directly or indirectly come into contact with it begin to suspect it of illegitimate practices, and the fight is on. So, for some years, the great packers have found themselves confronted on the one side by the consumers and, on the other, by the farmers and the live-stock interests; with consumers and farmers in general agreement on one point—distrust of the packers. For this condition, the only remedy was obviously public investigation and whatever such investigation might bring.

To the Federal Trade Commission was entrusted this investigation. The Commission dug deeply into the customs and practices of the packing industry. It presented volumes of testimony and reports. It recommended drastic supervision and regulation of the industry. Probably no public investigation has been conducted in recent years with so much heat and mutual recrimination. The packers' accounts were impugned. Investigators of the Commission were accused of being partisan. The packers were charged with suppressing their records. Congress demanded an investigation of the Commission. Investigators employed by the Commission were either discharged or left its employ, and the findings of the Commission came for the moment to naught.

But if it accomplished nothing else, this investigation served one extremely useful purpose. It taught the public again that the first step in the public control of any industry consists in the public control over records and accounts of that industry. While this is by no means a new lesson, it is apparently one that has to be relearned on each occasion. It is an observed fact, painful but true, that the government can best trust those records, accounts, or statistics, to whose collection it has been a party. Even where interested parties have the best of intentions and are most scrupulous in their motives, accounts of practices that are being scrutinized tend to become confused, incomparable, and generally untrustworthy. For this reason the accounting system of the railroads and of public utilities of all classes are either of government origin or are under close public supervision. If, then, public regulation of the packing industry is wanted, such regulation must find its point of departure in the control of records and accounts.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

During the present Congress several moves were made to regulate the packing industry. The most promising of these was embodied in the Kenyon-Kendrick bill. In this bill ample provision was made for the regulation of the accounts of the packers by clauses establishing uniform accounting, publicity, and the right to investigation by the Federal Trade Commission. By the time the bill had come out of conference, however, a House bill, much less drastic than the Kenyon-Kendrick bill and free from the provisions just cited, was accepted by the Senate and House conferees. This compromise measure, which assigns general supervisory powers over the packing industry to the Department of Agriculture, has become law. The degree of emasculation which the original Senate bill suffered in conference is succinctly indicated in the remark, ascribed to Senator Kenyon, that "The Senate is the Goat." Which is only partially true, for he failed to mention the Senate's constituents.

It is by no means certain, however, that the law in its present form will prove without value. Much depends on the prompt and effective exercise of the powers of investigation. Yet when Secretary of Agriculture Wallace states, as he is reported to have done recently before the American Institute of Meat Packers, that it is the purpose of the administration to prevent violent fluctuations in the industry and to maintain an evenly moving distribution of meat at fair prices for all who handle or eat it, he is outlining a program of business control far more comprehensive and drastic than anything that is presumably contemplated in the present control bill. It is one thing to hope and pray for cooperation, fair play, fair prices and no discriminatory practices, but it is another to have the legislative and executive power to enforce these ends, whenever they are not voluntarily conceded. For the packers are still engaged in private business enterprise and, in spite of gestures on the part of the government, they still appeal for aid and comfort to established and tested economic principles. "The (packing) industry," Mr. J. Ogden Armour said recently, "must not blind itself to the fact that the ratios evolved out of centuries between living costs, operating costs and sales prices cannot be permanently wiped out even by a world war. Economic laws cannot thus be overturned. Social and sentimental readjustments must be tempered by economics." In a world such as Mr. Armour describes we surely need no public regulation. And Mr. Wallace may well encounter rough sledding in attempting to divert the natural economic forces that now control the packing industry into paths of public regulation.

The Open Door for Raw Materials

ONE of the most alluring hopes of international peace was that founded on the doctrine of free exchange, brought into operation in Great Britain by Cobden and his associates in the middle of the last century. The basis of that hope was enlightened self-interest, the belief that the nations could be united by bonds of trade so that like good merchants each should have a stake in the prosperity of its customers. This theory was first challenged in the interests of the home market —the conception of an industrial state which should produce as nearly as possible all things entering into its own consumption, and gain commercial power abroad by exporting the surplus. To foster this production recourse was had to protective duties; and the driving out of a foreign by a domestic product was hailed as a triumph—McKinley's victory over British tin plate was celebrated in the same terms as Washington's victory over British arms. The need of securing supplies of raw materials on the part of more limited nations led to the rapid extension of colonization, to imperialism which Cobden recognized as the fatal enemy of his plan for a peaceful world. The first tendency of an imperialistic state is to add, by preferential tariffs, the market of its colonies to its own home market; the second, and one only recently becoming evident, is to monopolize to its own uses the supply of raw materials within its dependencies.

The extent to which the first tendency has advanced since the beginning of the century, and especially since the war, is revealed by a report of the Tariff Commission upon colonial tariff policies. From the excellent summary published by the New York Times it is clear how rapidly the open door is being everywhere closed.

The policy of France has always been to control the markets of her colonies. She occupied Tunis under an open door agreement, of which the last vestige vanished in 1919; and she has recently interpreted the annulment of the German right to the most favored nation treatment in Morocco as implying a withdrawal of similar rights from other nations. Japan's open door agreement on the annexation of Korea expired in 1920. The self-governing dominions of the British Empire began in 1897 to evolve a system of imperial preference along with domestic protection; and in 1919 Great Britain herself, the home of free trade, granted preferential treatment on dutiable imports originating within the Empire. The United States has fol-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lowed this policy with respect to Porto Rico and the Philippines.

But this tendency, fraught as it is with rivalry and division, is by no means so threatening a cause of war as that toward monopolizing raw materials by differential prices and export duties. In what may prove to be the most significant of the addresses delivered at the Institute of Politics at Williams College, Signor Tittoni presented a situation full of danger. He pointed out how from the time of the economic conference of the Allies in 1916 to the Brussels conference in 1920 the attempts to deal with the problem of the apportionment of raw materials had broken down—how agreement after agreement, pledge after pledge, had been made only to be ignored. He explained this complete lack of good faith on the part of statesmen by a hypothesis which an American audience must have found sufficiently plausible, of "a coalition of economic interests stronger, more powerful, than the governments themselves." He cited the Anglo-French agreement to divide between them the resources of the world with respect to oil, against which the United States protested. He gave examples of further combinations by which necessary commodities such as cotton, silk, hemp, sulphur and mercury, might be controlled.

"Export duties in a limited field existed before the war but they have now been extended to an excessive degree to all essential products of which there is a scarcity in the world."

He pictured the plight of the smaller, more limited countries under this reign of economic terror, "closing their markets to unfair competition of foreign goods, the low price of which is due to the lower cost of raw material," opposing discriminating prices by differential duties, and export duties by similar duties on such raw materials as they possess. In short it was no exaggeration for him to speak of a world going back economically into the dark ages.

Nations seldom go to war to force their goods into a closed market. The practice of Great Britain in the opium war is fortunately rare. But it is easy to see that in the increasing scarcity of materials hungry peoples may fight to break a monopolistic control of the means of existence, from the lack of which they are suffering. This is one of the causes of war which should be seen in advance and provided against. It was foreseen at Paris, but so far from guarding against it the Peace Conference definitely added to the evil. The sections of the Treaty of Versailles providing for the mandatory status of the acquisitions of the victors are so loosely drawn that although the spirit of the system is clear, in practice each beneficiary is able to treat its mandatories as its own possessions and exploit them both as to imports and exports to its own advantage. Signor Tittoni calls on the International Bureau of Labor to gather material and report on the situation, since questions of wages and employment are closely bound up with that of raw materials. The failure of every international conference and meeting of the League of Nations to take effective steps to deal with the matter, however, makes the outlook toward the Labor Bureau anything but promising. There is still the Washington Conference, the members of which represent all types of special interest entering into the problem. Great Britain, France and Japan are the leaders in the policy of trade monopoly and exclusive control of raw materials; Italy is, as Signor Tittoni shows, one of the chief sufferers; China is a victim, and Siberia is surely marked for sacrifice. For this reason if for no other the Far Eastern Republic should be represented at the Conference or the United States should definitely hold a brief on its behalf. The freedom of these weaker nations from commercial imperialism has a significance beyond their own right to self-determination. If their status is allowed to become that of spheres of influence, the world is putting itself at the mercy of a commercial autocracy stronger and more ruthless than even the predatory governments which it makes its tools.

The extension of such methods as Japan is employing in Korea, Manchuria and Shantung, and Great Britain in Kwangtung is certainly one of those questions of the Pacific which are of vital interest to the world as involving the danger of war. The open door in the widest sense is demanded not only for the entrance of trade, but of peace.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1921, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER; DANIEL MEBANE, CIRCULATION MANAGER.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY ALVIN JOHNSON
FRANCIS HACKETT ROBERT MORSS LOVETT
PHILIP LITTELL

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS, FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE; REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How Labor Could Control

LEWIS CARROLL once indulged his gift of satire at the expense of political dichotomy—a two party system, said he, involved the ennobling conflict of the Outs against the Ins. The Ins attempted a program: the Outs endeavored to block it. So successful was the result that in Carroll's mythical realm of Outland (perhaps not so far from Alice's pool of tears) the people tried it in economics. It was not uncommon, he relates, to see a farmer with a pair of oxen pulling a plough one way while a couple of mules industriously hauled it the other,—and the plough stood still.

Industry has approximated this desirable state of affairs. We have the capitalists, or employers, or investors; and we have labor. Each spends its time strengthening defences; forging weapons; preparing for war; fighting. They even talk the language of war; of ultimatums, good offices, conciliation, mediation, arbitration, peace protocols. In the face of all this production is expected to go on; does go on; an observer from Mars would be surprised not at the existing disorder but at the *relative* lack of it. Nevertheless the situation cannot go on forever and may not go on much longer—witness Russia and Italy—and the thing to do is to find a way out. Production is a co-operative process, not an affair of a yoke of oxen one way and a pair of mules the other.

Hence we examine the tools in the economic toolhouse. By all odds the most effective of them are the great corporations, great because they have developed effective cooperation beyond any other known machinery. Especially they enlist the financial cooperation of the general public through issues of various classes of securities, which appeal to the saving instinct, the sporting instinct or the exploiting instinct as the case happens to be. The result is a huge group of investors whose combined power to achieve is infinite. Their possibilities are so great that one may visualize a Brandeis of the future, who as a corporation lawyer will shift the economic frontiers as the Brandeis of the eight-hour-day cases shifted the constitutional frontiers.

Corporations are worth studying and worth respecting. And if we come to the study with some professional respect, the bold and simple outlines of the arrangement readily appear:

First. Most corporations have at their financial base certain borrowed capital. This is represented by bonds; perhaps by preferred stock; sometimes short term notes; sometimes all three. This is really borrowed capital, and is a secured investment. It draws regular interest. But it has no power and no right of control—unless the industry is going badly. Bondholders do not vote for directors; they clip coupons.

Second. All corporations are controlled by their common stockholders. These stockholders are, in many corporations, not true investors; they "took a chance". They backed their knowledge of the industry and the stockmarket and business prospects, and they expect a large return through dividends and through growing value of the stock. They would not say so, but they looked for something for nothing; they bought the stock for a rise, and to collect large dividends if they can. This class is under attack as exploiters. It is also the group who, through stock ownership which carries with it the right to elect directors and thus to manage, controls the corporation. When there is a war between labor and capital—a strike—this is the fighting line on the capitalistic side. The secured investors are far behind the guns; their money is backed by tangible property and not altogether by hope of corporate production.

This second financial class is likewise entitled to respectful analytic study. In theory every one hundred-dollar share of common stock represents one hundred dollars of actual "money or money's worth" put into the corporation's plant. In practice it frequently represents nothing of the kind. It often covers "water"—that is to say, nothing, which is made to appear something by putting in property, good-will, for instance—at tremendous overvaluation. Today by the device of stock without par value, that is to say, without any stated sum of money printed on the certificate, the necessity of watering stock on the sly is made unnecessary. You can organize a corporation in many states and issue a couple of million shares of no-par-value stock with nothing behind them at all except hope. People buy that stock for a rise, which in substance comes to this, that the corporation, having got a little capital together through legitimate borrowing on bonds or the like buys or builds a plant; produces at a profit; makes money; and the value of the paper shares heaves upward. The stockholder merely bought on the chance that the plant he invested in would produce more than it consumed, and his paper share entitled him to take a fraction of the surplus.

The legitimate side to this operation lies in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fact that these stockholders have a power of management. Where they actually do manage, throwing in brains and judgment and skill with their money they render a service entitling them to more than simple interest on their money. As a matter of plain fact however they usually do not manage; they sign a proxy which comes around once a year in the mail. A small group do manage and earn much of what they receive; but the larger proportion merely buy, hope, hold and cash in when they can, reaping where they did not sow. The use of their money is worth the current rate of interest; the value of their management is nil. Everything over interest is unearned increment—which is merely another way of saying that it was earned by someone else; someone who did not get all he earned—or, to speak plainly, by the men who worked in the corporation's mills or mines.

Just here it becomes possible to think of a businesslike end to the economic war. Who are the people who have a right to capitalize the hope of the plant's earnings? Who are the people who can decently gamble on their output? Who are the people who have most right to ask for control of the plant? The answer is obviously in favor of the staff of the plant, including, of course, the chairman of the board, the directors, as well as the oilers and feeders and loomfixers. That the large majority of employees should have to spend their spare time devising means to fight the control of their own plant is simple foolishness.

To imagine a plant in which the employees, including, as suggested, the chairman of the board, the president and so on—own all the common stock and the resulting control sounds a little like romance. It certainly is not profit sharing, nor employees' stock ownership. But it is possible and simple. Suppose a trade union with sufficient affiliates controlling all the processes in a factory, or better still, a guild union instead of a craft union. The collective unit makes, let us say, cotton yarns. From top to bottom there is no yarn process which it does not control. At present the best it can do with that control is to shut down the yarn mill unless the employers grant higher wages or better working conditions. Suppose however the union decided to make yarn on its own behalf; it knows the processes, needs only management, which it would have to hire, and capital, which it would also have to hire in the open market. Thereupon it hires managers and borrows money, buys or rents a yarn factory, runs it on approved business lines, sells at a profit, sets aside part for depreciation, for repayment of its borrowings, for a wage reserve in bad years. No single process in the industry would have to be changed, but each man would be working for himself and his "wage slavery" would become merely an occupation in cooperative endeavor.

This is the dream, and we seek for possibility of its realization. The machinery is ready to hand. Granted a plant for sale, and a collective labor unit able to operate, and the corporate organization could be drawn by any able lawyer. It would require formation of a corporation with no-par-value stock, issuable to and held by—and only by—the men to be employed in the plant. The stock is tied to the job, and with it goes control of the plant. There would be provision for the usual underlying financing by issue of bonds, notes or preferred stock. The holders of these issues ought to be represented on the board of directors at all times, but a majority would always be elected by the common stock. One thinks of the danger that the employee-stockholders would divide every last cent of the receipts and go on a spree, as did the Russian workmen in the flushed days of the early Soviet regime. Any corporation lawyer can provide against that; does so every day to protect the bondholding class against the present stockholding class. He provides in his incorporation papers that out of the profits a stated amount shall be applied to paying off the borrowings; a further proportion shall be set aside for depreciation; still more for a reserve for the lean years. The rest can be distributed. If any of these provisions are broken the bond-holding class immediately takes over control.

Questions of detail arise. How shall the stock be distributed? According to the fairest appraisal of the value of the employee-stockholder's services. The general manager ought to have more stock than the unskilled worker. His vote at a stockholders' meeting ought to be worth more. He has earned it. What about wages? Every employee ought to draw a regular base pay just as a partner in a firm is entitled to his drawing account; he must live. How about labor turnover? One hopes this scheme would lessen it; but men will always leave old jobs for new. When a man leaves his job he must leave his stock too,—resell it to the corporation, to use the vocabulary of corporation law,—for a price. What price? The amount by which the value of the stock has been increased while that employee held it. If while he held it bonds have been paid off and reserves accumulated out of profits then the employee's stock entitles him to his fractional share of the accumulations; he has actually earned it during his

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tenancy of the job. That is what he gets when he leaves. The corporation cannot be paying cash indiscriminately as men leave? Then the amount due may be paid either in cash or bonds or preferred stock as the corporation is able; the retiring workman emerges as a bondholder, who if he does not like to hold his bond may sell it. Who would lend money on that kind of a proposition? The writer ventures to suggest that any well-managed labor union which could demonstrate its ability to make cotton yarn successfully could sell its bonds as rapidly as many concerns whose securities are marketed every day. Roger Babson only the other day suggested that many of the employer-stockholder class would be glad of the chance to put their money into investment securities bearing a relatively large yield, abandoning the stockholding field to the workers.

Many large interests are doing exactly this. Their fighting days are past; their problem is to consolidate their holdings. At least one great capitalist who had bought stock which represented water and hope and sold for twenty is closing out his deal by reorganizing, exchanging his common controlling stock for non-voting preferred stock yielding a secured seven per cent and so passing into the investment class. His lawyers have so protected his investment that however reckless the new stockholding control may be, he can resume control if his security is ever endangered. This is the relation the investors ought to bear to the employee-stockholders in our supposed yarn factory. While the plant is well managed, they draw their fixed interest; when it is badly run, they exercise the bondholders' right to manage it themselves.

The employees' side of the story has yet to be told. The money could be found. But finding the labor union willing to try the experiment is a more difficult job. Many unions decline to accept reponsibility for production. If they control the industry in fact, such evasion of responsibility is merely immoral; the older and wiser unions are ready to meet the demand. The system of craft unions, creating labor units not for each plant or production unit but for each separate process, is as effective a means of decentralizing the workers in a plant as can be devised. They get together sympathetically in times of strike. But they do not work together. Some unions are not a "good moral risk," as the credit men say. Many industries are not integrated units like yarn-factories. Yet it is only a question of time until the business proposition put to organized labor will be accepted.

Here is no appeal to a misty State whose ownership relieves of pressure and stifles initiative. Nor is there any attack on private property; on the contrary, it is the emphasis of the strength of property. It is not a blow at our settled economic institutions; it is the sane use of them.

Or must we wait for sabotage, warfare and general misery to end an economic dichotomy which Lewis Carroll's dreamy professor examined, analyzed and discarded in misty Outland, exposing its failure with gentle bitterness to an interlocutor who—ignorant of mere modern economics—found it strange that industry should depend on elements at war?

A. A. Berle, Jr.

The Dilemma of France

ESSENTIALLY short views have been taken by the Bloc National—the predominant party in the French Chamber, elected under the auspices of M. Clemenceau, at the end of 1919. Its first act was to throw down the man whose popularity carried it to power: presumably because he was not nationalist enough. The Bloc National is the reply to all tentative movements towards internationalism. M. Clemenceau was the implacable opponent of Wilsonian internationalism; but he did not see how France could manage without England, her nearest, strongest neighbor. Because of his concessions to England there is now open talk of impeaching him. Every few weeks there is somebody or other to take up the threat originally uttered by Marshal Foch—the High Court for Clemenceau. This is not merely an example of political ingratitude, a pleasant warning to all of us not to become heroes and prophets in our own country; it illuminates in a flash French policy.

More and more has it become concentratedly nationalist. M. Millerand was the first to speak of marching "with or without the Allies," and although he was compelled by England to promise after Frankfort not to act separately again he actually did so by recognizing Wrangel, by saving Poland from the consequences of her own folly when England thought Poland deserved punishment: and was forthwith made President of the Republic! His successor M. Leygues was too colorless to revolt against the Alliance; but M. Briand while giving lip-service to the Entente has proved throughout his ministry that above all France means to be independent. It is true that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

independence is only a synonym for isolation: nationalism pushed to its logical end must leave any country solitary. Therefore whenever the formal rupture is really imminent France hesitates and only the egregious but consistent Pertinax is frank enough to demand that unless France can get her own way in the Entente she should quit the Entente. As England cannot permit France to have her own way, the Entente is virtually non-existent. It disappeared, except in name, a year ago. Still, under the Versailles Treaty France and England are made partners: their separation implies the repudiation of the Treaty. Be it remembered that if the Treaty is hard on Germany it also furnishes Germany with certain safeguards; and its repudiation in such circumstances, signifying the triumph of French nationalism, would be a bad thing for Germany now, a worse thing for France in the future, and a fatal thing for Europe—that is to say (since it is impossible to distinguish between the fate of one continent and the ineluctable fate of another) for the world—in a space of time easily envisaged.

The most vital point in European politics is precisely this point of Franco-British relations. It would be folly to depict England as the apostle of sweet reasonableness; but it so happens that in respect of Germany she takes a view which is doubtless dictated by her commercial necessities, but which at any rate has the merit of being conciliatory and pacific. It is the most stupid taunt imaginable that England is a nation of shopkeepers. If trading makes for decent international dealings, makes for friendliness (as it may well do, though it may sometimes provoke terrible rivalries) then three cheers for trade! Without inquiring too closely into England's motives in this matter, it is certain that she wants a fairly prosperous Germany with whom she can do business, and a Europe in which there will not be a new upheaval every month. She is aware that just as America can never realize her credits on Europe because she would have to take them in imported goods without equivalent exported goods, so the Allies can never recover tremendous indemnities expressed in astronomical figures from Germany and would indeed cry out that blue murder and treason were being committed were Germany to load unpaid products upon them. England knows that Germany cannot be kept down for long, and what she will do when she gets up depends upon what is done to her when she is down. England thinks there is a prospect of peace by resuming peaceful relations; unlike France, who thinks peace is only possible by perpetuating the state of unilateral warfare in which she remains on top. Naturally were I analysing British policy there would be many reservations to make; but these are the general lines of British policy and have been ever since Mr. Lloyd George in March 1919 candidly exposed his real views.

Now in any partnership there must be a predominant partner. England has been, in spite of lamentable concessions to French policy, the predominant partner. On many occasions she has held back France. She held back France in May this year, when the whole country had been whipped up in readiness to seize the Ruhr. She held back France in the original Peace Conference when France demanded the complete detachment of all German lands west of the Rhine from Germany. She pulled back France from Frankfort. It would be easy to multiply instances on which England has been, rightly or wrongly, a restraining force, but the fact is too notorious to need proving. It is not difficult to understand how the Bloc National, sinking deeper and deeper into its nationalism, is furious against England as well as against Germany. It may be doubted whether England has not become for many good Frenchmen much more the enemy than Germany. Not only are they prevented from doing what they consider necessary for their subsequent safety, but they are humiliated by the consciousness that hitherto France has occupied only a second place in the European concert when, according to all the rules—militaristic at least—she is easily the strongest nation on the continent. It is fine to have a giant's strength but it is exasperating not to be able to use it.

Everything, in the view of these nationalists—who though powerful do not represent the whole of France, as we shall see—demonstrates the need of employing this numerical superiority while France still possesses it. It may be that some day France will no longer possess an army which is big enough—other things being equal—to conquer Europe. Germany is disarmed: and at her mercy. The French argue that Germany will certainly seek her revanche. Therefore, without any false sentimentality, without any international nonsense and foolish fraternity, it is only sensible to keep Germany crushed. That is why the Left Bank of the Rhine should be kept permanently (according to the thesis of M. Tardieu the treaty permits the occupation in perpetuity); that is why the Ruhr with its rich coal mines and its blast furnaces should be taken and controlled on some breach of the treaty or other which is bound to occur; that is why Poland is to have as much of Upper Silesia, plebiscite or no plebiscite, as France can secure for her, since Poland is France's bondservant and soldier in Eastern Europe; that is why Germany is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

continually to be harried about indemnities and disarmament. It is the policy of menaces, coercion, sanctions, and demolition of the Reich. No one could condemn this policy on diplomatic grounds—and morality does not enter into calculations when a country which has been so often invaded by an hereditary enemy fears yet another invasion—if it were not for the awkward fact that there are more countries in the world than France and Germany.

Did they exist in a vacuum, the Franco-German duel might be allowed to go on generation after generation, and France would be justified, on the German plea that necessity knows no law, in doing her best to injure her adversary. But France won the war because she was helped by England and America, and England and America have to live in the same world, and they demand that their interests and their opinions shall be respected; and England and America may or may not come to the rescue of France again if she pushes the defeated enemy too far.

It must not be supposed that leading French politicians do not realize the impossibility of stereotyping the victory. They are aware that they cannot, like Joshua, command the sun and the moon to stand still. They know that Europe is not a painted picture, but a living entity. They are sensible of the ridiculousness of standing in a pretty posture with their foot on the neck of the prostrate foe. But there is that Bloc National; and it is so easy to talk the current patriotic language; and anyhow a French Ministry does not last, as a rule, very long, and après nous le déluge! I have been privileged to have conversations with the most distinguished Frenchmen, and I am convinced that they perfectly understand the true precarious position. Surprising as it may appear, the eventual policy of M. Poincaré is to bring about a rapprochment between France and Germany. He who is pushing other premiers to intransigeance foresees, as every man who gives a moment's thought to the matter foresees, the day when from sheer necessity there will be drawn up between the two countries a scheme of cooperation. For the present the protagonist of this policy is M. Loucheur, the multi-millionaire, the man of affairs, the man who is only incidentally a politician and primarily a company director. Regarding the situation without undue patriotic prejudice he comes to a conclusion that should be the conclusion even of the politicians, if politicians were not usually somewhat silly people moving in an unreal world: the conclusion that though France and Germany have hitherto been enemies it would *pay* them both better to be friends. Indeed there is nothing else for it: either they must be blood foes, and in that case it is only a question of how long France can hold Germany down, how long France can keep some kind of semblance of solidarity with England; or they must by hook or crook compose their differences and collaborate. The second alternative has made much headway—but then so has the first. Now one policy and then the other prevails. France is, of course, falling between two stools. She should, three years after the armistice, make up her mind which it is to be—war or peace with Germany—and accept one or the other method with all its consequences.

The idea of a rapprochement is not new. M. Caillaux's chief crime was (so it was declared) secretly to strive for a Franco-German entente. There are several newspapers which have openly suggested that the cards might profitably be shuffled in this sense. It must not be supposed that a Franco-German rapprochement is necessarily hostile to England. When I mentioned the possibility to several persons engaged in British diplomacy they appeared to consider that it would be rather a good thing, not at all implying the dissolution of the Franco-British Alliance but on the contrary enabling the two Channel countries to march once more in the same direction. There are, it is true, objections from the British viewpoint. First it may be presumed that France would only orient her policy German-wards by way of reaction against British hegemony. Then it should be understood that the association would be rather economic than political, and British trade interests might suffer. For example, France can find no other way of utilizing the newly acquired iron ore of Lorraine than by sending it to the Ruhr furnaces; alone, France cannot make the most of her potential riches, but with Germany—a great Franco-German consortium being formed to exploit all the iron resources of the French and German basins—as partner, the iron and steel manufacturers of England would be faced with formidable competition. So it is with the potash of Alsace: France by the restoration of this province now shares a virtual world monopoly of potash with Germany. Germany is still stronger, in potash, than France and can beat her in the market. Which is it to be? Is France to grow rich on her potash by an arrangement with Germany, or is she to find this wealth practically worthless? It is possible that economically England would not really relish a Franco-German bargain, but the politicians would not—could not—oppose many obstacles unless it were carried to extremes. But if France took up the British thesis of business rather than reparations (in the exaggerated impossible sense) and military domination, it would not be to please

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

England but would be, as it were, against England. It is not inconceivable that there should be a race to form a commercial alliance with Germany: though the arrangement may be triangular; and in that case lovers of peace will rejoice.

But what are the chances of this current of commerce prevailing against the political current? (For be it remarked that although France is engaged in making all kinds of business pacts, occult and avowed, in Central Europe, with Poland, with the Balkan States, this aspect of the Quai d'Orsay policy is of secondary importance. I do not believe in France as a colonising power, whether the colony is called Syria or Hungary or Poland, even if the primary purpose is to fortify herself, as she supposes, against Germany. I do not agree that in the policy of seizing the Ruhr France was animated by business considerations—though the financiers naturally would have taken advantage of the policy—but by political considerations, that is to say by this obsession of the German peril.) It would indeed be rash to prophesy whether France will turn from force to trade. Last year there were negotiations between French and German business men and the politicians were nearly won over. Nearly—but not quite. The Quai d'Orsay was quickly in the ascendant. Powerful influences were at work this year to bring about the most far-reaching accords: accords about the Eastern markets, as well as about the repair of ruined regions; accords about coal and iron; accords about exports and imports; accords which would have amounted to a general economic cooperation. Suddenly the politicians once more checked the economists. There was a rumpus about the Leipzig trials. There was a first-class row about Upper Silesia—which is, in spite of the Polish oil and industrial concessions to France, at heart a political affair. That is to say, it involves the question of France's security by force—France demanding the biggest possible armed Poland pressing on the shoulders of the smallest possible disarmed Germany (Russia being counted out for twenty years)—even at the expense of economic efficiency in the management of Silesian mines and factories. As has happened so often, Bloc National politics swamped the efforts at commercial collaboration.

The Briand cabinet more than any other has zig-zagged. M. Briand himself has in certain circles expressed himself with astonishing reasonableness, and one doubts whether he is at all with the political advocates of hostility, but he strikes one as tired and indifferent, only making a big effort when things have gone wrong. M. Loucheur, even during the political crises, pursues his conversations with Dr. Rathenau. Sometimes there is a sudden demand for the occupation of the Ruhr by the Premier and sometimes it is the Premier who denounces such a move as inept. Never before have there been so many contradictions. Is it incompetence, apathy, or tactics? How far does the cabinet control the situation and how far is it controlled? Is it considered that the art of statesmanship is to be enigmatic, to puzzle possible opponents? Anyhow there have been violent oscillations between the two policies of rapprochement with Germany on the economic terrain and of ruthless antagonism on the political terrain. Amid these fluctuations it is difficult to see what will be the ultimate aim. But what is certain to my mind is that the so-called policy of security means inevitably another war in Europe—which means, if wars are fought to obtain peace, that the last war was utterly lost—since Germany must rise up one day to recover all of which she thinks she has been unfairly dispossessed. Such a policy will also lead to the formal renunciation of the Franco-British Entente; and the Entente may indeed be regarded as the barometer of Europe. On the other hand it is to be feared that if a large economic understanding with Germany is long postponed, it will become impossible. Those who like M. Poincaré think politics can be played for a certain time, and then economic understandings reached, forget the psychological factor. There is an unparallelled bitterness in Germany against France; and this growing hatred may soon thwart any further attempt at a concordat, and Europe may be committed to the sterile policy of keeping an alarmed and perilous guard on the Rhine. France must choose quickly or she will fall irretrievably between two stools.

SISLEY HUDDLESTON.

The Farmer Corporate

LAST year's collapsed grain market did more than empty the farmer's pocket. It served as the irritant which bestirred him to an inevitable but delayed march upon unfinished business. It precipitated The U. S. Grain Growers, Inc., dedicated to conquest, by the growers, of their ultimate market.

The farmers had taken possession of their local market years before. When, twenty-odd years ago, they awoke to the disappearance of competition in local buying of grain for shipment, the farmers began to form associations for owning elevators and shipping their own grain. There took place a muscle-making struggle, with much practice in the neglected art of working together. The farmers had the railroads to whip as well as the grain "trust." (Discriminations in railroad

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

service made existence precarious for the early farmer elevators.)

In spite of all handicaps, they made good. Such a grain growing state as Nebraska came finally to have a cooperative elevator at practically every grain shipping point. The grain states all told now contain, it is claimed, about 3,000 of them. Their success is no longer questioned. Many of the private or "line" elevators sold out to the cooperatives. The rest remained to compete with them. A virtual balance between the two systems was struck and the grain buying monopoly at the point of production was definitely ended.

Then the farmers' associations discovered that their work was only half done. When they came with their grain to the terminal market, behold at the window the familiar phiz of their old antagonist, the trust. Once their grip on the local market was loosened, the "line" men had fallen back to positions previously prepared in the rear. Theirs were the terminal elevators where the grain must be stored and prepared for sale. They controlled the exchanges on which it had to be sold. The farmers were out of Egypt. They were not yet in the promised land.

Before this second battlement the farmers sat them down in doubt and disagreement. Some local assaults were made. A group of northwestern farmers built a cooperative terminal elevator at St. Paul. The Non-Partisan League was conceived in the sin, as the grain exchanges viewed it, of striking for the goal in North Dakota by means of state-owned terminal elevators. Nebraska farmers secured a state law requiring the Omaha grain exchange to admit cooperatives as members.

None of these movements had united the farmers or had yet succeeded, when the grain slump came, in breaching the wall. The Nebraska law had been ineffective. The North Dakota elevator was unfinished. The St. Paul experiment had not spread. The associations of private grain dealers still controlled the terminal markets. Naturally, even if not wholly justly, the farmers held the controllers of the marketing machinery responsible for the shortcomings of the market. Their hesitation ceased. They came together in a representative meeting of farmer organizations in July, 1920, and planned a special committee to study what to do. The "Committee of 17" called in advisers, and labored, and early in the present year The U. S. Grain Growers, Inc., was brought forth. Meetings were held in the different states to pass on the plan. It was everywhere approved.

Thus was launched the largest and most widely sponsored cooperative organization in the history of farmers' cooperatives. Its name is reminiscent of United States Steel, American Sugar, Amalgamated Copper and such other corporate entities as by their names suggest the power to twist potentates and powers and peoples in their fingers. If it should live up to its expectations the United States Grain Growers, Inc., will be worthy of the initials of Uncle Sam. Behind it stand most of the farmer organizations in the grain states. It is approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. No less conspicuous a financier than Bernard Baruch is among its supporters and advisers.

The U. S. Grain Growers, Inc., issues no stock and takes no profits. It is an association of farmers designed as a central warehousing, marketing and financing agency for the local cooperative associations. The grain farmer contracts with the United States association to receive his grain through the local coperative elevator and market it. The corporation contracts to buy his grain outright, receive it on consignment, or handle it as the agent of his pooling asociation, should he elect to join a pool. The farmers who enter into these contracts are the voting members of the association and govern it through a board of directors elected at a representative national convention.

The banker of the movement is to be a finance corporation or corporations organized as a subsidiary. The finance corporation will discount grain paper for local banks and it will finance warehousing facilities.

By this mechanism the organizers hope to unite into one stream under their own control the flow to market of the cooperating farmers' grain. If they succeed, the member farmers will handle their own grain, from the field through the terminal market to the manufacturer and exporter. They believe that, with a considerable fraction of the country's grain so controlled, an evener flow to market and a steadier price can be maintained. The farmers have their suspicions of a marketing system under which fifty times as much wheat is sold on the Chicago exchange as passes through Chicago elevators. They expect to gain, too, through control of the mixing and cleaning of their grain in the terminal elevators and by the command of credit which their finance corporation is designed to give.

Yet, even if they held little hope of direct profit, I suspect that the farmers would be in this movement. The grain farmer is convinced that he is taxed without representation in a monopolistic grain market, and the spirit of 1776 is in him. It is getting to be a matter of principle with him to break a path to market along which he can pass without the aid or consent of any organization

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of middlemen. This spirit is perhaps the stubbornest factor in the farmer movement.

The question of his success in this particular venture is anybody's guess. Most of my grain "trust" friends say they see within it the germs of early decay and death. They saw the same germs in the local cooperative movement to which they have now surrendered. Yet a sickening number of these early ventures did fail. The U. S. Grain Growers is a very large undertaking. It calls upon its promoters to think in millions where they have been dealing in hundreds. It remains to be seen whether a major part of the cooperative associations and their members link up with it. It could fall by its own weight. The grain dealers who have formed a national association and a fund to fight it don't seem to think so. But I admit it.

If it were a new structure from the ground up it might be dismissed as a grandiose daydream. Being based on a solid foundation of local cooperative societies it cannot be so dismissed. Another thing in its favor is the habit the farmers are forming in their local cooperative ventures of putting technical business operations in the hands of well paid specialists. If the farmer directors of the Grain Growers choose well their operating specialists, that will go far to make them as dangerous as the Chicago grain exchange thinks they are.

Should it succeed, will it be the farmers' trust which our financial districts view with such dread? There are dangers and defects in producers' cooperation which consumers' cooperation escapes. But the smartest of my grain "trust" friends probably has the right answer. "Let them come in," he says, "with all the bars down. I can do business on a narrower margin than they can. Let the two systems compete and keep each other on their good behavior. I can continue to thrive and we shall all be happier, the farmers because they can see that no trust is gouging them, I because of the general better feeling in the business."

If he should be wrong and the Grain Growers turn out so successful and so ambitious that they drive their rivals out of the field, then to United States Steel, American Sugar, Amalgamated Copper and the rest has merely been added The U. S. Grain Growers, Inc.

Stand or fall, the organization of the grain growers is a great and fine adventure. It represents the working out of a spirit of freedom and responsibility and cooperation in a great class which has too long let itself be the dupe of politics and of business. These farmers are seeking no help from any one. The Grain Growers are not asking for a single shred of legislation. They are proposing merely to help themselves in a business way and by business methods. They have fought and won their local wars for a free market. Now they are endeavoring to join in a great entente to drive their campaign to its natural conclusion. A central marketing medium for the local cooperative associations is a logical necessity. If The U. S. Grain Growers, Inc., fails to answer that need, the irrepressible farmers will merely, in due time, take the next road that opens up,—perhaps the political road of the Non-Partisan League with its state-owned terminal elevators.

The "independent farmer" is as determined as that to be independent. WALTER LOCKE.

The Wilderness of Suburbia

THE other day I was walking along one of those interminable streets, in the remoter part of Brooklyn, that begin at a subway line and end in a swamp or a tidal inlet or an ash-heap. A clutter of dingy-new apartment houses lay behind me, and the wide sweep of land that ambled toward the horizon was punctuated here and there by cottages between which the spaces gaped more and more uncouthly until at last there was scarcely any other reminder of the city's existence than the curbing of the streets or the sign on a lamp-post. Presently a little settlement of farmhouses came into view; and at the crossroads was a barely decipherable milestone telling how many miles it was to the Brooklyn Ferry; and beyond them was a villa in the early republican style, with a massive front and great square pillars and a spacious porch; and eventually I came to a body of water beside whose nearer bank stood an old mill—the relic of a manorial past.

By closing one's eyes to the jagged line of rooftops in the distance one could easily fancy himself back in the eighteenth century: in fact, the walk was a rough cross-section of the city's development in time. It was a little hard to realize that this dissolute landscape, this no-man's land which was neither town nor country, was part and parcel of the greatest city on the continent. It seemed to me that I had passed through the twilight zone of an essentially suburban civilization.

In the whole development of Brooklyn—and Brooklyn is a typical modern city—nobody had apparently any conception of the city except as an ugly accretion of factories, warehouses, and shops, set in a tangle of mean streets, such as one finds about Borough Hall or Wallabout Basin. Was it any wonder, then, that the chief reaction to these conglomerate physical developments was a desire

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to escape from them into a different, and if possible more rural environment, as soon as the burden of the workday was over? This was beyond doubt the healthy human reaction, for if city life were the mere huddling of human beings within a limited area, the desire to live in cities would be the expression of a purely brutish gregariousness; and the more completely one escaped from that sort of existence the greater would be the possibility of finding at least the humane satisfactions that can be derived from the unrestricted view of a sunset or the opportunity for delving at a little garden patch.

In the natural attempt to get away from the fusty physical realities of the nineteenth century city there was, I say, no comprehension of the sort of cultivated life that is possible only in cities. The nineteenth century American town, with none of the cultural resources that cities like Oxford and Paris had inherited from the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, was the negation of a city—and suburbia was a negation of that negation. The result was not a new synthesis, but a further deterioration. In the course of a hundred years of road-laying, street-planning, house-building, and street railway extension city life, in the sense that a contemporary of Plato or Dante or Dürer would have understood the words, ceased to exist. The city became a traffic thoroughfare; the home, a dormitory; and the neighborhood a stony wilderness. All the social and cultural intercourse that residence within a city's boundaries carried with it for the great mass of people would not have satisfied the rude congenialities of a tribe of Alaskan Indians.

It is of course pathetic that the metropolitan, with his boasted "civilization" should forever be trying to escape the city—which means at bottom that he seeks to get rid of the institutional equipment of his civilization. It is perhaps equally pathetic, however, that this attempt to escape the city should never succeed. In the section of Brooklyn through which I had passed, a blind man could see how the open spaces of villadom would in the course of a few short years be filled up, and how the neighboring walks into the open country would in the end lead nowhere but through interminable blank streets, as dull and depressing as those from which the frantic suburbanite had escaped. It was the same in Queens, the same in the Bronx, the same in Yonkers and Mount Vernon, and presently it would be the same up in the Westchester Hills, between the Hudson, the Sawmill, and the Bronx Rivers.

As the city, in the nineteenth century sense, continued to grow, two significant things happened: on one hand the dweller in suburbia lost to a large extent the ability to take advantage of such cultural resources as the city still retained in its theatres and concerts and art exhibitions and the like; and on the other, he failed to develop equivalent resources in the neighborhood of his home. An art gallery in Montclair and a stock company in Yonkers do not alter the picture in its general outlines. The commuter, who spends a good part of his day, from an hour and a half to three hours, in wandering, like Tomlinson, between Heaven and Hell, presents a spectacle much more humiliating than a man without a country: he is a man without a city—in short, a barbarian. Small wonder that bathtubs and heating systems and similiar apparatus play such a large part in his conception of the good life. These are the compensations that carry him through his perpetual neurosis—and heaven help him when Yankee ingenuity and salesmanship give out!

In recent years there has been a tendency to regard the growing "movement to the cities" as a dangerous phenomenon. As a matter of fact, however, this is the normal outcome, as Messrs. Geddes and Branford have pointed out, of the transition from the life of the hunter in the mountain wilds at the hither end of the valley section to that of the agriculturist who occupies and works the fertile valley-bottoms: the city is the flower of a well-developed civilization, and it is as silly to look upon the movement into the city as a menace as it would be to refer to the shepherd Giotto's becoming a painter in Florence, or the poacher Shakespeare's becoming a playwright in London as a calamity. The real danger is that men are *not* moving into cities; or rather, that the cities into which they do move are simply close-packed areas in which their lives are confined, instead of being marked by multitudes of common institutions—clubs, guilds, theaters, gymnasia, academies, universities—through which their lives might be expressed. The proof of this is that people who settle in a great Western metropolis like London or New York speedily discover that it has little to offer them, and quickly join in a significant counter-exodus. The great modern city, for the most part, does not create a common bond but a common repulsion. Suburbia—that vast and aimless drift of human beings, spreading in every direction about our cities, large and small—demonstrates the incapacity of our civilization to foster concrete ways and means for living well. Having failed to create a common life in our modern cities, we have builded Suburbia, which is a common refuge from life, and the remedy is an aggravation of the disease!

LEWIS MUMFORD.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As a Fired Man Thinks

THE rumor spread through our shop that the big lay-off was to occur on the following Tuesday. Over half of us were to be discharged. For some time our shop had been losing men, two or three a day. We had watched them leave with indifference, because the chance seemed slight that our turn would come. And now over half of us were to be discharged at once. This was serious. The odds were against each individual. Already we seemed to have lost contact with our routine.

Most of us had been in the shop four years. During the war, when the shop had been crowded with a lot of men—some of them unskilled or mediocre workers—we had several times been complimented by the local commandant for our achievements. Later, after the armistice and after the poor and not very good workmen had been "weeded out" the whip began to crack over our heads. "Speed up—More efficiency—See what the other Navy Yard is doing."

There were plenty of men to be had. The larger became the hungry crowd outside the Navy Yard gates, the louder and more frequently cracked the whip. Men who had been thanked for their efforts as mechanics were now referred to as "farmers," and by their comrades as well, since to disparage one's neighbor was to increase his chances of being fired and one's own chances of keeping the job. The spirit of the shop had changed. We were back to normalcy. The hungry, desperate crowd of unemployed outside the gates was growing larger, while the number of jobs was growing smaller.

Before we went into the war the town had been a poor affair. Very few men had been employed; there were few decent houses and no paved streets. About the only signs of life were a few sailors who did not have money enough to go to the city nearby. Formerly most of the small, shabby business buildings were tenanted by saloons. Some owners left, and forfeited their homes rather than pay taxes.

With the war many workers were needed at the Navy Yard, and wages rose as the need of them increased. Everyone had to work—it was even the duty of women to do men's work. Not to be working was to be a traitor, a dangerous enemy. Today these sentiments are out of fashion; they smack of bolshevism.

As workers poured in, the town quickly changed. Fine business blocks, churches, lodge buildings and residences sprang up. Streets were paved. There was activity, interest, pleasure-seeking. People talked of their comparative bargains in getting homes, of the price of gasoline, of the moving-picture shows. The attendance of the churches doubled; at the movies it increased twenty-fold.

We workers spent much of our spare time looking for somewhere to live. The government built a large hotel which we tried to manage cooperatively. It was filled with roomers who paid high rents, but as there seemed to be a shortage of many thousands of dollars somewhere, the hotel reverted to private management. We also tried a cooperative store, and it did a large business at top prices, until, here too, thousands of dollars disappeared, and the store went into bankruptcy. A chamber of commerce which had been only a name became a powerful agency for transferring the worker's wages from his pockets to those of the merchants and real estate agents. The local press sang chiefly one song—"Boom-ta-ra-ra Buy a home." There was life everywhere.

Such was our town during its brief departure from normalcy. No one worried about his job; work was plentiful.

Before we went into the war our labor union, like the chamber of commerce, was a name. But drives were the order of the day, so we had a drive through our shop. It turned out to be a very successful drive, in spite of the fact that government employees cannot be coerced into the union. The men stampeded into the union by the hundreds. The night the new members were received into the union was a memorable one. They did not join in the sense of wishing to maintain a principle; they began to drop out at once, and have continued to do so steadily. Those of us who are left form a mildly benevolent lodge which pays sick benefits. Locally we have little interest in, or capacity for, Industrial Democracy. We do not claim any equity in our job; we do not dispute or look for the underlying causes of our big lay-off; we confine ourselves to a few petty grievances over the selection of the victims, and then only as it affects ourselves. Our moral and intellectual natures are rather cramped. Perhaps we have been too closely confined to our machines.

Then Tuesday came. All day men discussed their chances, leaving their machines to talk with other men, or hailing some passerby. Each time that the foreman appeared he was watched anxiously. At last, a quarter of an hour before quitting time, he came with a long list of names in his hand. I was among the first to be approached. I was pleased to see that my name was near the foot of the list. Anyway, I was not the first to be chosen for sacrifice.

"——, you are laid off, beginning tonight."

"Discharged?"

"Yes."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The foreman's hand and voice were trembling. I was glad that it was over, and watched curiously to see who would be the next victim.

I would have to tell my wife. That was part of the system. She would understand that we were impersonal numbers in a Navy Yard, without voice and without feeling. We were now suddenly torn loose from our home, our friends and acquaintances, from almost everything except the system. No one was to blame. I was not responsible for the disaster. The foreman was very sorry, and did not sleep the night following the lay-off. The superintendent of the shop was also very sorry, but pointed out that the wage allowance for his shop had been greatly reduced. Of course the idea that our fully equipped shop might turn to making useful implements of peace was preposterous. What if the world did need locomotives: private profit had the exclusive privilege.

All the associations of four years are now broken off and seem to be distant and unreal. We must leave town at once, because there is no work here. But this is true everywhere else. "No work here." We are adrift on a sea of unemployment, but we must pull blindly on some course or other. Men do not sit still and starve.

The world has moved since the so-called Cleveland hard times. The excuse, often advanced, that we are reducing taxation by creating unemployment is on the same plane of intelligence as that of the woman who threw the baby out of the window and carried a pillow downstairs when the house began to burn.

There is one country where profiteers and unemployment do not flourish. Many of our faces are turned toward the East, where a light shows through the darkness.

A. J. TAYLOR.

CORRESPONDENCE

[The New Republic welcomes communications from its readers in regard to subjects of current interest, and especially concerning articles which have appeared in its columns. Those of 300 words or less are necessarily more available for publication than longer letters.]

Freedom in Virginia

SIR: The Board of Visitors of Virginia Military Institute on Saturday, August 20th, expelled Professor—and Colonel—Robert T. Kerlin because of an open letter he had written to the governor of Arkansas. In that open letter, published in full in the Nation of June 15th, 1921, Professor Kerlin had appealed to the governor in the name of justice and humanity to review the cases of six Negro farmers of Phillips County under sentence of death. In justifying that appeal, Professor Kerlin recited the following facts: that the Negroes of Phillips County were endeavoring to end the crime of peonage, or slavery, to which they were subject; that the trial before the Supreme Court of Arkansas had shown they had neither instigated nor begun the riots of 1919; that the Negro farmers had armed themselves only after they had been threatened and molested; and that they had been tortured by whipping and in an electric chair to force them to testify in such a way that they would incriminate themselves and their fellows. Professor Kerlin called the impending executions of six men a "crucifixion" and called upon the governor of Arkansas "to take the matter into your private chamber and give it an hour's earnest consideration, as before the Eternal Judge."

In the light of these facts it may be left to your readers to judge whether the expulsion of Professor Kerlin from Virginia Military Academy constitutes an assault upon the tattered shreds that remain of academic freedom of utterance in this country.

New York City. HERBERT J. SELIGMANN.

The South Sees through the K. K. K.

SIR: "A Member of the Ku Klux Klan in New York" criticizes the editorial in The New Republic. It is certainly a strange thing that a society that professes to stand for law and order and that claims to be 100 per cent American and makes such patriotic pretensions should have resurrected from a dishonored grave the name of a society that because of its outlawry and ghastly crimes, was suppressed by the government. Woodrow Wilson, in his History, says as to the original Ku Klux Klan—"Brutal crimes were committed; the innocent suffered with the guilty, a reign of terror was brought on and society was infinitely more disturbed than defended." Thomas Dixon in his novel The Clansman and D. W. Griffith in his cinema The Birth of a Nation attempted to glorify the original Klan. I have before me the official publications of the reorganized society. The claim is made that the original society "by its unselfish patriotic achievement stands preeminent as the greatest order of real chivalry the world has ever known," and this new organization "is to commemorate those men and perpetuate their spiritual purpose and ideals." A number of leading newspapers of the South and many leading people deprecate this new society. It is reported that ex-Confederate organizations and among them the Richmond Daughters of the Confederacy, oppose the movement because they believe it will be used as a mask for outrages. This has already happened in parades in several places before the last election to terrorize the Negroes and keep them from the polls.

Chicago, Illinois. DUNCAN C. MILNER.

At Issue with Mr. Garet Garrett's Mumbling the Railroads

SIR: Mr. Garrett's article Mumbling the Railroads printed in the issue of The New Republic for August 10th conveys very much the impression of the argument of a clever lawyer, who, by suppressing vital facts and laying undue stress upon others not really relevant, tries to persuade the Court that his client's case is something more tangible than a mare's nest. To impugn Mr. Garrett's sincerity is not the purpose of this communication. But it is plain either that he has overlooked the major premise upon which the whole case rests; or else that I am entirely mistaken in my understanding of it.

Did the debit and credit accounts between the government and the railroad companies represent ordinary business obligations voluntarily entered upon by both as contracting parties there can be no doubt that they should be offset against each other and that those owing more than is due to them should settle the difference in cash. These accounts, however, rest upon an entirely different basis. The railroad companies had no voice whatever in the transactions that they represent. On their part these transactions were entirely involuntary.

The sums due the companies from the government represent in the main compensation for the use of their properties during the period when they were taken over by the Government and were

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under its control and management. The justness of their right to compensation cannot be questioned by any reasonable person: what the amount should be is not germane to the present contention, but I may say in passing that if, for its own use, the government takes possession of the property of any of its citizens, it is only fair that it should pay the owners as much as they could earn from the properties when under their own control; and when the need of their retention no longer exists, that they should be returned to the owners with their physical condition and earning power unimpaired. That the railroads did not earn as much while under government management as the amount of compensation determined by Act of Congress is not in point. It does not even prove that the companies could not have earned that amount had the roads remained under their own control, or to be more accurate, in their own possession without power to regulate either their income or operating expenses. The fact is that the compensation was fixed by Congress and represents the current earnings of the companies during the period of government operation. The justness of claims for undermaintenance during that period rests upon whether in fact the properties were allowed to deteriorate in physical condition: if they were, the owners should not be required to bear the loss that this entails.

The sums that the government claims are due from the companies represent improvements and additional equipment purchased by the government at extravagantly inflated prices, without the stockholders' consent or approval. While it may be that some of these betterments would have been made by the companies had the properties remained in their quasi-control it is most unlikely that they would have been made, since to use current earnings for the purpose would have been suicidal, and to make any but the most imperative at the excessive prices for labor and materials then prevailing would have been sheer madness. Be this as it may, however, it is quite certain that few if any of the companies were in a position to make the improvements save by raising additional capital for the purpose, and that none of them would have considered it good business management to think of trying to pay for them in any other way. Should they now be required to offset the respective accounts against each other it would be in effect compelling them to pay for the improvements out of current revenues urgently needed for other purposes, and to settle the balance as best they can; and as the position of the different companies in respect to these accounts varies widely, it would mean bankruptcy for some of them. It is no answer to say that instead of asking the government to let them fund the debts due to it, the companies should pay them by raising the necessary capital in the open market. Government regulation has made that quite impossible. Under the circumstances the only just and right course for the government to pursue is to pay the railroad companies the sums due them and to accept from the companies their reasonably long-term obligation for the involuntary debts.

If you or Mr. Garrett can show wherein I am wrong in this contention I am open to conviction. My only interest in this matter is my general interest in all that concerns the welfare of the people of the country as a whole.

FREDERICK W. GOOKIN.

Chicago.

In Further Criticism of Mr. Garet Garett

SIR: In his article entitled Mumbling the Railroads which appeared in the New Republic of August 10th, Garet Garrett says of President Harding's plan to fund the railroad indebtedness to the Government that: "We only insist that it shall be precisely defined". It appears to me that it was not the purpose of Mr. Garrett precisely to define the plan, but rather it was his purpose to prejudice the public against the plan and generally against the railroads.

There are two very important aspects of the matter that he does not touch upon. The Federal Government during the period of its control of the railroads made additions to the properties taken over for its own purposes and in its own way without conference or agreement with the owners. The Government asked for immediate reimbursement under a plan of cross billing which was equivalent to cash payment.

We have a situation here that to my mind is inequitable and should appear as such to all people and especially to those who pride themselves on being fair minded and impartial. The situation can be made clear by a simple question. What, I ask, would be thought of the claim of a tenant who for his own purpose, in his own way and without conference with his landlord should make additions to the premises he occupied and then demand that his landlord reimburse him in cash for his outlay, not offset by the rent agreed upon in the lease?

There is another aspect of the matter that should receive recognition by those who are willing to look upon both sides of a question. The railroads would not on their own initiative have made additions to their property costing many hundreds of millions of dollars without first having provided themselves with the funds to pay for the additions. In view of this fact and in view of the difficulty of obtaining money at the present time it appears to me only reasonable that the Government should provide for funding the cost of additions that were made while it had possession of the railroads.

GEORGE G. TUNELL.

Glencoe, Illinois.

Do We Soft Pedal the Soviets?

SIR: I sometimes disagree with positions taken and conclusions drawn in your magazine; I suppose because you and I are individuals. But I am continually refreshed by evidences of your underlying detestation of that hateful theory—the domination of one man by another except within strict bounds of law and authority delegated by the community for the common weal. Tyranny is just as hateful if a secret police sends a man to Siberia or a single policeman enters our house or opens our baggage on suspicion. It was to keep the executive and its subordinates within legal bounds, that "our fathers fought and bled." We seem to lack their spirit, at least in the North.

One point I think you should insist on more. The failure of the Soviet government in Russia is owing to a disregard of economic law. An unlimited issue of paper money not convertible into something of permanent value kills exchange. A denial of personal property kills production. Why should I work except for wages or produce anything unless I own it, or am paid for producing it? Forced labor is slavery. It will not work. The denial of the right of personal property is robbery. It is equally fatal. The Russians have some valuable social qualities. They can cooperate more readily than any others of the leading races. True they have not learned the feeling of shame at asking and taking a bribe for a public service. That is because it is the only way they can get their pay. Corruption can be reduced by law and by adequate compensation. Socialism, as far as it implies willingness to yield personal privileges for the common benefit, is life. Communism, or denial of personal ownership, is death. It is killing Russia.

C. F. JOHNSON.

Hartford, Connecticut.

A Converted Fight-Fan

SIR: I gave the issue of the New Republic, which contained the Dempsey-Carpentier fight report, to a "fight-fan" friend of mine. He has bought and read each issue since and is beginning to think that prize fighting is "not a high form of sport." When I meet him now he talks of things other than baseball and prize fighting; and the bagnio press has lost its charms for him.

Being only a "dirty machinist" I do not wish to judge whether it was right or wrong for you to have "wasted space" on that "degrading topic." The New Republic is a "Journal of Opinion," and its opinions are such that the enlightened readers hope to see them permeate people bewitched by the yellow press.

With due respect to the readers who are disappointed in the articles devoted to the fighters and the fight, I can vouch that these articles were the cause of the "sport" losing one supporter. If I judge correctly, these disappointed writers hope to see the "sport" lose all its supporters; so why protest when good is beginning to be done—that is, in my opinion.

JOHN M. GANCZ.

Warren, Rhode Island.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Riley and the Christian Scientists

SIR: Your issue of June 22nd contained a letter from Mr. A. F. Gilmore, Christian Science publicity agent, protesting against Mr. John Macy's comments on the methods of the Messrs. Putnam in suppressing my article on Science and Health in the fourth volume of the Cambridge History of American Literature.

This letter is quite characteristic. What it lacks in logic it makes up in poetry. The Christian Science defender of the faith does not attempt to refute the arguments but falls back upon Mr. Irving Putnam's abusive letter and ends with some meaningless quotations from scripture. There is no meeting of the direct issue which in this case was the sudden suppression of an article on *popular* bibles in a *literary* history.

Something also might be said regarding Mr. Putnam's published claim that he never read the article in question and also his private statement to me that publishers do not have time to read all that is issued by the house. The latter struck me as true when I found out what the Putnams have been recently publishing. I discuss only a book against the Jews and one of the works of Mrs. Stetson, the Christian Science leader, who has recently been advertising so largely in the metropolitan dailies. As the Jewish Tribune in its issue of May 13th remarked: "The policy of the Putnams is not to offend adherents of any religious belief . . . . Then we ask why did the same firm publish The Cause of the World's Unrest, a book full of vicious and unjustified attacks upon the Jews of the entire world?"

Another of their publications that the Messrs. Putnams are evidently unfamiliar with is Mrs. Stetson's My Spiritual Aeroplane. Its lofty tone of indifference to mere mundane facts is quite out of keeping with any accurate historical account of the origin of Science and Health, such as is promised us in the new, denatured edition of the offending fourth volume.

The Putnams are indeed most considerate of their public. As Mr. Irving Putnam declared: "We cannot afford to offend two million readers." This number doubtless referred to the 200,000 Christian Scientists in the country (for such is the number given by the federal census) and in addition to the 1,800,000 friends and acquaintances to whom they lend their books.

And since Mr. Macy wrote his article the Mormons have appeared over the horizon and have offered another opportunity for the Putnam's to their thin consideration for others. Mr. Irving Putnam inadvertently declared that the article on the Book of Mormon would remain in the book as the case was different "because Mormonism was dead" (New York Times, April 19th.). When Elder Ballard of the Council of the Twelve Apostles, called post haste from Salt Lake City, asked him what he meant by that, he replied: "I only meant that the Mormons were geographically further removed than the Christian Scientists."

How does the Einstein theory of relativity, of the interchangeability of space and time, help one to be considerate? But more followed in the way of value to the lacerated lessons of the Latter Day Saints. According to the Salt Lake City News (May 5th) Elder Ballard "wrote a letter to Mr. Irving Putnam congratulating him upon finding out the character of Riley. He stated that the 'Mormons' had long ago learned that he was merely a flippant grinner at the world and its events." To this letter Mr Putnam replied: "I thoroughly agree with you that the effusion quoted from Riley in the New York World on the 25th renders any further comment on the part of intelligent people quite unnecessary."

So here I am: according to Mr. Gilmore an "Evil that fears exposure" (whatever that means); according to Elder Ballard an "old offender" (because I once wrote a book at Yale on the Founder of Mormonism); and according to Mr. Putnam's reply to the Mormon Elder (who protests against "Riley's slurful tone") "an unknown quantity," unfit to associate with "intelligent people."

In conclusion may I quote from Mr. George Haven Putnam's work entitled The Censorship of the Church of Rome and its Influence upon the Production and Distribution of Literature.

On page 12 of Volume I we read: "There is something almost pathetic in the long series of attempts made by popes, councils, bishops, congregations, and inquisitors to protect the souls of the faithful against the baneful influence of the ever-increasing tide of literature that was pouring forth from the various publishing centres."

WOODBRIDGE RILEY.

Siasconset, Massachusetts.

Should America Stand Aloof from Europe?

SIR: Those who hold European interests are not American interests should take a lesson from the controversy now going on over the plebiscite in Upper Silesia. This episode shows that another world war is being narrowly avoided, if indeed it is not still in prospect.

Yet we Americans stand placidly by, with our arms folded, making a motion as if to wipe our hands off of the whole disagreeable incident. We are like infants playing on the brink of a precipice, blissfully ignorant that the next step may plunge them into the abyss below. American interests! What are American interests? Is it possible that anyone can have lived through the experience of the late war without realizing that American interests are worldwide?

Here we are, standing face to face with the possibilities of another world war and by our pharisaic attitude in remaining aloof from the world settlement we have made ourselves powerless to raise a hand to prevent such a catastrophe. Our army fought to prevent another such world calamity as the last war. Our politicians are fighting to make us helpless to prevent its reoccurrence. In the war we threw in our entire weight to the last dollar and the last man in order to secure a settlement. Now we refuse even to risk our influence on the side of a just settlement of what may easily develop into a worse war than the last.

Is it possible for anyone to candidly reflect upon this situation without coming to the unavoidable conclusion that we have faced squarely about and are taking exactly the opposite direction we followed in 1917 and 1918?

With the withdrawal of America from the world arena, France has been thrown into a state of terror bordering upon hysteria lest she be abandoned again to the German monster. In this fright she has grown desperate and is seeking by fair means or foul to throttle Germany so that she can never recover.

It is not for us who like cowards turn our backs at this critical juncture to speak harshly of France for taking this attitude. What can we expect? Do we expect her to lie down quietly on the brink of this European volcano without raising a hand in behalf of her national security?

England has acted as the balance wheel for Europe for centuries and she is still doing so. This policy is dictated by the exigencies of national safety. When a continental Power grows to proportions threatening her security she throws her weight in the balance against such a rival power. To us beyond the Atlantic this may look at times like a selfish policy and we speak thoughtlessly of her as "perfidious Albion." But the thoughtful know that we would do exactly the same thing if confronted by the same circumstances.

Fear for their own security is the driving cause of the evil ambitions of these two highly civilized nations. France wants protection in her national existence and an open-door policy guaranteeing her equal rights in her intercourse with the rest of the world. With this secured, her evil ambitions would vanish forthwith. England wants this national security and along with it an equal opportunity to trade in the world markets, which is life to her in the present organization of her industrial system. She asks no more.

Why then do these two nations drift toward war with each other? The reasons are found in the desperate attitude of France in trying to secure her national safety without regard to the consequences of such action upon the economic welfare of Europe or even upon the peace of the world. England's life depends upon trade, and, being secure in her national safety with Germany humbled and disarmed, she objects to having France ruin Europe economically with the resulting disaster to her markets. She has higher motives than these to be sure, but these others are mentioned because they must necessarily be predominant in view of their vital importance to her very life.

Is it not, therefore, obvious that when we refuse to join hands with the other enlightened nations of the world in securing a just and permanent settlement backed by the organized might of the world, we are contributing directly to this dangerous situation? We withdraw our support and counsel just at the time they are needed most.

The issue lies bare. If we desert the world in this crisis we deserve the censure of the ages.

P. J. HALLDORSON.

Chicago, Illinois.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Back to Victoria

The Glass of Fashion, by A Gentleman with a Duster. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

HAVING reached page 75 of this odd book in a browsing and indifferent mood I suddenly came on a long quotation that seemed to me unduly familiar. It was from a review of Margot's autobiography that appeared last year in a certain journal of opinion. As I read over those stirring and heartfelt words, the author of which is fastidiously not mentioned in The Glass of Fashion and equally fastidiously shall not be mentioned here, I thought to myself, "Well, now, is this book so absurd? Why be so critical? It is a bit innocent, perhaps, quite seraphic here and there, but fundamentally, as we say, not so bad. Let me see, this quotation, how does it stand up? It could be worse. He calls it 'perfectly just and contemptuous criticism.' Hear, hear! And he runs on, 'we must infer that there are numbers of educated Americans whose affection for England has been weakened, and who have perhaps ceased to believe that the privileged classes in England have any contribution to make to the higher life of the human race.' Stupendous inference, but, on reflection, let us not deprecate the stupendous. 'Such an effect I regard as deplorable, coming, as it does, at a particularly critical juncture . . . I do not exaggerate in saying that this effect is disastrous.'"

The occasion, as this gentleman evidently sees it, is distinctly interesting. He does not attempt to say that Mrs. Asquith and Colonel Repington do not belong to English society, that Repington is a Cholly Knickerbocker or that Mrs. Asquith is a freak. He is honest enough to admit that both are, in their ambitious way, only too awfully representative. He describes Colonel Repington's qualifications to speak as an insider in terms that the nimblest apologist cannot duck, and while he says that "Mrs. Asquith belongs to that insurgent class of the commercial rich which broke into society soon after the second Reform bill," he does not disguise the actual fact that her "class" did break crashingly in. He insists, indeed, that during King Edward's reign her class "completely overwhelmed" society. And he says, with much discrimination, "she is the more deadly foe to our ancient traditions because her attack is not aimed at the primitive virtues of humanity—those moral outworks of the social organism . . . On the contrary, she is a devoted wife, an exemplary mother, and she believes in God. Her attack is the more fatal, because it is aimed from the cherished centre of domestic life. It is in my view, whether she is conscious of it or not, an attack upon manners."

The object of this book, curious as it may sound, is to rally to the defence of morals and manners in so far as they are impersonated by Fashion. The author does not himself presume to say that he represents Fashion. "My standpoint," he puts it, "explains everything. It is that of the central classes [why not the Grand Central classes?] I regard the summit of Nobility from the middle-distance of the Gentry. It is in the interests of the entire Commonwealth, but from the position of the central classes, that I criticize the set of people who now occupy the summit of our national life and by their manners and morals create that 'climate of opinion' in which we all live."

Is this really absurd? At first, in my lamentable exuberance and in the cocoanut-shying impulse which I regret to say I still retain, I felt this was definitely absurd. But it isn't in the least absurd. The Gentleman with the Duster is a most significant personage, well worth watching. He sees, quite sharply, that if certain valuable and invaluable equities in the existing English social scheme are to be preserved, the fast and flashy people who damage those equities from the inside are intolerably dangerous and they must, as in the days of Victoria, be suppressed at all costs. The outer world must not be disillusioned about the Nobility. What is more, it must at once be reminded of the real claims that the inheritors of this social scheme possess to gentle and simple consideration, the world over, and while it cannot be argued that the objectionable exponents of Fashion do not "belong," (since the fact that they "belong" creates the problem), it has to be strongly affirmed that those others who do belong, belong in a very different way.

To perform such a task with "modesty, self-effacement, restraint and delicacy"—that is to say, good breeding—is not altogether practicable. It is quite difficult to distribute social brickbats and bouquets without occasional misses as well as hits, and this particular commentator insists on combining high-grade gossip with his altitudinous "spiritual" tone. But insupportable as he may seem to all those who do not realize the immense interests at stake, I think he has had a pretty sound conception of the job he sets out to perform. Admitting the night-clubs, the "monstrous flood of modern animalism," the jazz bands, the meanness of Mr. Balfour to servants, the chorus girl "in the padded recesses of a motor-car," the women who "scream" over a story, the midnight bathing, the "disease of cynicism," "the strumpets of Coventry Street,"—admitting all these dreadful, odious and repulsive things, what is there to set against them for the sake of God and St. George? He answers with great sagacity, Victorianism, simple faith, kind hearts, reverence, restraint and all gentleness.

These "fast" people are not useful. They are not happy. "If we know in our hearts that they have no encouragement to give to moral earnestness, intellectual striving, spiritual aspiration, or even physical effort; if we find them to be the wreckage of the human spirit miserably dragging the chain of their days from the tents of Vanity Fair to the wilderness of disillusion; then, truly, we can do the State great service merely by removing these false captains from the conspicuous van of English civilization."

Out they go, the "fast" set. And what comes in? The noble-minded. "Flippant people, with their tiresome *clichés,* their incessant giggling, and their little blasphemies, have not the least idea that the highest form of wit and the gayest exercise of good humor are to be found only among the noble-minded." The precise samples of wit that we are given, derived from Mrs. Gladstone, do not strike our degraded taste as very exhilarating, but "the centre of life for people like the Gladstones was moral earnestness," and of this the author speaks with sincere joy. Also he defines, quite passionately, the essence of English manners. "Manners, rightly regarded, are the *style of the soul* and they can never be genuine, never be anything more than veneer or polish, unless they proceed as naturally as the exhalation of a rose from the inmost beauty of the spirit, that is to say, from humility, tenderness, loving-kindness, and desire of excellence."

A few side-swipes with the famous Duster are offered at Bolshevism and Darwinism, and there is a strangely disproportionate amount of space given to prostitutes, in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whom the Gentleman takes a sorrowful interest; but the gist of the book is that the real English gentleman and the real English lady have manners and morals not in the least represented by the bizarre figure that is Mrs. Asquith's and the thick hide which is Colonel Repington's.

This is undoubtedly true. Manners are the finer part, the essence of civilization, and the manners of nice English people are incomparable. They understand the really exquisite art of human relationships. Henry James gave his genius to showing what a beautiful social instrument, what a beautiful human instrument, a civilized English person becomes, for any life whatever to play on. But this isn't the whole of the story.

If we are to have gentlemen and ladies in a world of the "commercial rich," who is to support them? It comes down more or less to that. Mrs. Asquith "did not know" "Lady Frederick Cavendish, or the beautiful Duchess of Westminster, or any of the Hamiltons, the Spencers, or the Howards. I do not think that she has been an intimate friend of the Portlands, or the Lansdownes, the Cecils, or the Percys." Congratulations! But how long can the Portlands hold together without Portland cement? That is the whole problem of Victorianism over again, the problem of aristocracy needing plutocracy. For my part, I am more interested in Walt Whitman in the military hospital than Lady Harrowby in the military hospital. He seems to me a less expensive spiritual flower, somehow. But when it comes to "government of gentlemen, by gentlemen, for gentlemen"—see Veblen—then I am with this Duster man. Because I like certain nice English people I hope that the noisy privileged will lose and the quiet privileged win.

FRANCIS HACKETT.

Mythical Science

Studies in Comparative Religion, Legend, and Law, by Sir J. G. Frazer. New York: The Macmillan Co.

THERE is a tradition,—which not having seen in print I may designate as folk-lore—that at Oxford, Frazer is recognized as the only Cambridge man who can write well. Without wishing to subscribe to any invidious distinction against Bertrand Russell and others, I may, at the outset, testify to the magical quality of Frazer's way of writing. Only some sort of magic can compel one to read through a three-volume book of over sixteen hundred pages from beginning to end, and this too, despite a most thorough-going dissent from the fundamental ideas and methods at the basis of all of Frazer's anthropologic work.

Following the procedure of his Golden Bough a number of passages in the Old Testament are used as pegs on which to hang vast collections of myths, magic rituals, and popular beliefs of "primitive" people, collected from all collocation of biblical themes with primitive superstitions —all done with rather naive humor—produces most charming results. The treatment of the stories about the patriarchs as if they were actual history produces rather broadly humorous results, e. g., when Jacob is spoken of as squeeza free, even if somewhat uncontrolled, imagination shows itself in the suggestion of how the story of Samson and Delilah must have been told by the Philistines whom that lady freed from the burly free-booter. But perhaps the best illustration of an imaginative liberation from traditional ideology is shown when Frazer views the Deuteronomic reform and the destruction of the local "high places" as similar to the destruction of local or village churches to compel people to go to town. But though a pupil of Robertson Smith and able to quote many books on the higher criticism, Frazer is entirely devoid of a critical historical sense. There is no sharp difference in his mind between actual fact and the content of popular myths about legendary figures like Moses. Hence, despite the almost unrivalled industry which these three volumes show, there is rather little light thrown on the Old Testament or on the life of the people who produced it. Zeal in the collection of facts cannot compensate for the absence of the critical spirit which is the essence of scientific procedure.

It may seem ungracious, especially after one has derived much innocent pleasure from the book, to quarrel with the author on the score of scientific method. Indeed, in the preface, Frazer explicitly renounces any claim for his general views except as tentative or provisional hypotheses, pigeonholes in which the multitude of facts can be temporarily arranged. But despite this genial prefatory profession of scientific modesty, Frazer cannot be absolved from the gross intellectual confusion at the basis of his unhistoric and undiscriminating use of the comparative method and of the method of interpreting everything as a "survival." The fact that these methods are now almost universally accepted in our popular social science and are supported by the supposed scientific character of the doctrine of social evolution, only serves to make the charm and the imposing bulk of Frazer's book all the more dangerous.

Despite the fact that degeneration is as much a biologic and historic fact as progress, the belief in the universality of the latter is so fashionable that few dare to doubt the pleasant dogma that there are certain necessary stages through which all people must pass and that the savage or lower races of today, represent the stages through which all civilized or higher peoples must at one time have passed. This belief, like the older popular account of the social contract, has the advantage of enabling us to write history a priori. We need not trouble to find the actual facts of the past when our formula can tell us what they must have been. The method of explaining every puzzling social fact as a survival is thus an ingenious device for capitalizing our boundless ignorance of the past and making it an unlimited reservoir of easy explanations.

Those who push this method in the social sciences think themselves scientific because they imagine they are following a method which has triumphed in biology. But apart from the criticism which vague and speculative ideas like evolution have received from modern experimental biologists like Jacques Loeb, there are important differences to be noted. Unlike the social evolutionists biologists take great pains to make sure of their facts before explaining them. The works of the social evolutionists from Spencer to Frazer are indeed monuments of credulity. Printed reports by globe-trotters, missionaries, trained or untrained observers, are all taken for a hundred per cent of their face value. They have no use for the undemocratic question as to the competence of the observer or reporter. Some ing Laban dry as a lemon, and the latter as inferior in the gift of gab as in the finer reaches of cunning.

Without meaning to be in the least irreverent he is certainly piquantly human in his description of the irascible but kindly-hearted deity who indulges in copious curses to ease his feelings (when Adam and Eve disobey him) and who waives scruples at the sin of David's census on the receipt of half a shekel per human head. The value of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years ago when it was fashionable to write up the East Side of New York, literary gentlemen used to visit our cafés where we generously fed them the kind of stories they wanted to hear. In this respect we were not unlike the savages who also like to please the traveler looking for striking details and local color. But the resulting books, though pleasant to read, are surely not competent to support scientific generalization. Social facts are more complicated than biologic ones and their careful observation for scientific purposes demands an even more cautious and elaborate technique. When Frazer, like Spencer and others, generalizes on the basis of myths and practices drawn from different peoples, without knowing the actual history or descent of these myths, his procedure is more absurd than that of a biologist who would generalize from the conduct of animals belonging to different phyla, e. g., the flying of bats, birds and bees. Comparisons are not significant unless we are comparing facts of the same order; an outer likeness of legends is no guarantee of similar origin.

Frazer is on seemingly firmer ground when he deals not with legends but with laws or practices. Magical ideas as to the harm that might happen to an animal if its milk (or some part of its body), is heated, do seem to explain in part the curious importance attached to one of the original ten commandments, viz., not to seethe a kid in the milk of its mother. But the subsequent development of this rule and its elaboration by the Talmudists into the dietary code and kitchen ritual which governs the orthodox Hebrews to this day, completely escapes Frazer. For here we are on historic ground and the actual development of this ancient tabu illustrates the inadequacy of the method of "survival." Indeed, no institution is really explained by the mere fact that it is a survival. There is always something in the present which makes some old practices continue while others disappear. What determines the difference is a question of historic fact, and not of a priori assumption.

It is curious that Frazer like other amateur psychologists dealing with the oddities of human conduct should fall into the naive rationalism of the assumption that all the queer things we do, we do because they were formerly deemed useful. This really amounts to the assumption that man is originally a rational or economic creature. But the facts of history clearly indicate that as far back as we can go we always find man just as full of irrational and inexplicable quips as are the most civilized races today. Rationality or economic action comes, when it comes at all, not at the beginning of human history but as the end of a process of eliminating primordially wasteful and meaningless motions. The lapse into the naive rationalism of our popular theories of magic is all the more curious in Frazer because his teacher Robertson Smith long ago pointed out the priority of ritual or conduct over myth and belief. The aversion for boiled milk may be older than certain beliefs in magic; and belief in magic may have as little to do with the Bantu's aversion for the use of water as is the case with many children and vagrant adults in our own midst. So also the wearing of bells by the priest, to which Frazer devotes so much alluring erudition, may be much earlier than the belief that he would die if he didn't. Must we suppose that every farmer puts a bell on his cow in order to frighten off evil spirits? I once heard two very learned modern scholars explain the stamping and shuffling of feet at unpopular lectures as a survival of sympathetic magic. But a little reflection might have recalled to their attention that at German University lectures the stamping of feet is a sign of approval just as with us the clapping of hands.

Besides displaying on a large scale the frailties of our popular evolutionary social science Frazer's book illustrates the oft overlooked difference between imagination and insight. Frazer's type of imagination is the one that he himself glorifies as poetic fancy, "without which no one can enter the heart of the people." "A frigid rationalist will knock in vain at the magic rose-wreathed portals of fairyland." But the simple fact is that the scientific understanding of the nature of fairy tales actually comes not from the poetic fancy of credulous children but from rationally trained minds and that here we have the cause of the barrenness of Frazer's work. This conclusion imposes itself all the more when we compare Frazer with men like Maitland or Robertson Smith who use their imagination on the fragmentary material of history to open up for us new vistas on the life of the past. The latter are able to reconstruct the life of the past in its concrete fulness, only because their realistic imagination is supported by the critical sifting and checking up of evidence. It is only the abstract or lazy imagination that is repelled by the laborious methods of science. The imagination which is creative of insight finds in these methods indispensable nourishment and sorely needed support against irresponsible vagaries.

MORRIS R. COHEN.

A Social Bibliography

Modern Social Movements, Descriptive Summaries and Bibligraphies, by Savel Zimand. New York: H. W. Wilson Co.

THE reality of the Russian revolution, the spectacular growth of trade unions in the past five years, and the extensive amount of general discussion concerning such questions as workers' control and guild socialism, have made many people curious about the form and content of the "new society." Mr. Zimand has set himself the task of enabling such people to satisfy their curiosity by cataloguing in this little volume the books, pamphlets, and articles that men and women have been writing on these subjects for many years. Here are to be found theories, political and economic, speculations, descriptions, and formal programs. Historic doctrine rubs shoulders with contemporary practice. Within the compass of 260 pages, Mr. Zimand defines, enumerates, and classifies all social movements from trade unionism to anarchism; from the Plumb plan to Bolshevism; from the single tax to national industrial councils; and from revisionist socialism to the schisms in the ranks of the British guild socialists. What is a social movement, anyhow?

With a canvas so small, and a theme so immense, no one should quarrel with the artist for overlooking a tree here and blade of grass there. All that can be asked for is a fair likeness, and a discriminating one. In the sweep of his brush, Mr. Zimand is both bold and sure; but inevitably the fine shades are lacking. One section of the book, for example, is devoted to "trade union theory." Now, books on trade union theory are generally of two kinds. They are either statements of what the theory of an organized labor movement ought to be or they are analyses of the working principles and practises of the trade unions themselves. Perhaps Mr. Zimand is aware of both of these elements, for in this section he includes such books as Cole's Labor in the Commonwealth and Blum's Jurisdictional Disputes, or De Leon's The Burning Question of Trade

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Unionism and McCabe's Standard Rate. The reader is led to believe that he has found the key to at least this part of the bibliography. But only a few pages later, he meets another section called Special Studies which includes Motley's Apprenticeship, Stockton's Closed Shop, Whitney's Jurisdiction, together with twenty or thirty other studies, some of which are histories of specific unions, others surveys of types of collective bargaining, and a few of an entirely nondescript character. This impression of confusion in arrangement is not removed by a survey of the other sections of the book.

An even more interesting exercise is determining the principle by which some studies are included and others rejected. In this country very little has been written on what can properly be called "trade union theory." But not so many years ago Professor G. E. Barnett published in the Quarterly Journal of Economics two articles, The Dominance of the National Union in American Labor Organization and National and District Systems of Collective Bargaining in the United States, which come closer to being important and authoritative studies of trade union theory than perhaps anything that has been written in this country. The whole movement toward shop committees during the war and the recent struggles between the railroad unions and the operators are only specific aspects of factors which Barnett saw and described in these articles. Yet neither is mentioned. In the list of special studies Robbins' Railway Conductors, Miss Stecker's two papers on the Molders, and Barnett's Printers are omitted. I fail also to find any reference to the Documentary History of American Industrial Society by Commons and associates. Under Periodicals (presumably trade union), are listed ten papers, including the New York Call, and a reference to a directory of trade union periodicals, while the New Majority, the organ of the Farmer-Labor Party, is found with the Socialist periodicals. The bibliography on Copartnership omits, together with many other important studies, what is probably the most illuminating and penetrating analysis of profit-sharing in the United States by Boris Emmet. This may be due to the fact that copartnership and profit-sharing are not the same thing. But there is no way of telling whether that is the reason or not. It would be easy to list other omissions of the same kind. But it is enough to state here that they are many and important; and that it is difficult to discover the guiding principles on which was based whatever choice the compiler has made.

A feature of this bibliography of social movements is the definitions and short discussions of each social movement that introduce the list of writings on the movement. These introductions are designed to supply the users of the bibliography with an orientation that they might not otherwise have. How well the definitions perform this service may be gathered from the following: "The best definition of a trade union is to be found in the name itself which means the union of all in one trade." "The Cooperative Movement is a form of cooperative effort aiming at the association of producers or consumers in self-governing cooperative workshops or consumers' societies." "Lord Leverhulme, who has been described as the man who has done more than anyone else for the introduction of copartnership, defines this scheme as 'a means of better, fairer, and more just relationship of so-called employer and employee resulting in better productive activities.'" "Early in 1919 the former railroad corporation lawyer, and present attorney for the Railroad Brotherhoods, Glenn E. Plumb, formulated a plan, endorsed by the Railroad Brotherhoods and later introduced in the form of a bill in Congress, to the effect that railway employees shall share in the management of the railroads in the U. S." "Socialism, in so far as it has definable unity, is the social movement which seeks a system of organized industrial and political government, in which use, instead of profit shall be the dominant motive of production and its control shall be democratic." "Whereas anarchism and socialism were both born as theories, the name syndicalism is simply the French word for trade unionism, and originally had no larger significance. In 1902 the French Central labor body . . . declared itself against political action and in favor of what has come to be known as syndicalism."

LEO WOLMAN.

Fifty One-Act Plays

Fifty Contemporary One-Act Plays, by Frank Shay and Pierre Loving. Cincinnati: Stewart and Kidd Co.

THE growth of the anthology has brought us to the point where one may have a very practical working library of plays within a much smaller compass than even the proverbial five-foot shelf. There is an anthology of Elizabethan plays, one of Chief Contemporary Dramatists, another of Chief European Dramatists, a couple on the British drama, at least two more on the American, a most valuable collection of criticism under the title of European Theories of the Drama, and finally this latest book edited by Frank Shay and Pierre Loving and called Fifty Contemporary One-Act Plays.

The editors find it difficult to define the point of view upon which they based their selection of plays, but one gathers that they had in mind that ideal Little Theatre which would be neither commercial nor precieux, a theatre managed by Arthur Hopkins, John Williams, Winthrop Ames, Sam Hume, and George Cram Cook, and with a play reading committee of Ludwig Lewisohn, Barrett H. Clark, George Jean Nathan, and Francis Hackett. According to the editors, "the result will take care of itself." Yes, and the managers and readers will take care of each other! At any rate, it is for this theatre, which might well be established at Donnybrook, that these fifty plays have been chosen. There is no pretense that they are the best contemporary one-act plays, that they are the most representative, or even that they are the fifty that the editors liked the best, indeed the use of some of these last was prohibited by reason of copyright, but they are the fifty that a Little Theatre such as the one suggested would find of most value.

There is a fairly large proportion of new plays, either heretofor unpublished or untranslated, and the preponderence of American plays is very great; indeed there are twenty-two American plays as against five British, the next in number. It seems as though both Irish and French plays were somewhat slighted, but this may be because so many of the Irish are accessible elsewhere. The excuse does not hold with the French, however, where the omission is the more keenly felt. The American plays are well selected: they are not only good plays, interesting in themselves, but they cover a wide range of expression varying from the fanciful to the realistic.

As Mr. Loving points out in his Introduction there are some plays included which have not been obtainable in English at all before this, and such dramatists as Wied and Speenhof are almost entirely unknown to the general pub-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lic. Geographically at any rate the collection is probably the most comprehensive which has been published, for not only are Great Britain, Europe, America, and India among the contributors, but even South America is permitted a place with Interlude, by Fredrico More of Bolivia. On the whole it is a very satisfying list. The one-act play has been well established for generations in the theatre of other countries, and it is high time that we in America ceased to regard it as a mere by-product of the drama.

The book closes with two selected bibliographies, of which Part One is entitled The Books of the Little Theatre, and Part Two, The Plays of the Little Theatre. These two lists are nearly as valuable as all the rest of the book put together. To the Little Theatre itself, to the student of the Little Theatre and of the one-act play, as well as to that public which engages at all in play reading these lists of books and plays should prove something in the nature of a godsend. The work has been well done, and there was a real need for it.

Altogether there was a vacant spot waiting for this book, and it is pleasant to observe that while the book fits the vacancy neatly with no rough edges to be trimmed, still it leaves plenty of room for a sizable family to join it in due time. It is hard to be enthusiastic about an anthology because there is no single focussing point, but such enthusiasm as is possible in the nature of things this book deserves.

EDWARD HALE BIERSTADT.

Selected Current Books

Tudor Ideals, by Lewis Einstein. Harcourt.

Mr. Einstein, graduate of Columbia, writes a history of the political, social and literary ideals of Sixteenth Century England.

America's Power Resources, by Gilbert and Pogue. Century.

A popular account of the economic significance of America's coal, oil and water power.

Common-Sense Ethics, by C. E. M. Joad. Dutton.

The American edition of the work by a scholar of Balliol, Oxford.

Come Into the Garden, by Grace Tabor. Macmillan.

A compact volume for those who have small gardens.

The Index for Volume XXVII, which was completed with our issue No. 351, has been printed separately. It will be mailed on request, post free, to any subscriber who will send his name and address on a post card directed to the New Republic, 421 West 21st Street, New York City.

Contributors

A. A. BERLE, JR., was attached to the Russian division of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace. He is now with the firm of Rounds, Hatch, Dillingham and Debevoise.

SISLEY HUDDLESTON is a correspondent of the London Nation in Paris.

LEWIS MUMFORD has been associate editor of the Dial and acting editor of the (London) Sociological Review.

WALTER LOCKE is editor of the Nebraska State Journal.

A. J. TAYLOR is a former worker in a Navy Yard on the Pacific Coast, and lives in Spokane, Washington.

Among Dutton Publications

AN EPOCH-MAKING BOOK

The Manhood of Humanity

By ALFRED KORZYBSKI

Prof. CASSIUS J. KEYSER, of Columbia University, calls it "great in its enterprise, in its achievement, in the implications of its central thought, and mighty in its significance for the future welfare of men, women and children everywhere throughout the world." $3.00

AN AMAZINGLY FULL NOVEL

BRASS

A Novel of Marriage

By CHARLES G. NORRIS

This is not a beautifully tinted romance of the ideal married life; it is not even the whole revelation of modern matrimony. It is a keen, supremely interesting analysis of the situations into which hundreds of thousands drift who marry from motives as far apart as "love's young dream" is from a careless acquiescence in a rather cramping bond necessary to the comfort of a home. For those who from the sidelines of bachelordom wonder at the discords they see, the book is full of light.

The Philadelphia Ledger says:—
"Never has there been presented such a dispassionate, keen and unsparing study of the institution of marriage."

The New York World says of its people:—
"They are vital throbbing exemplars of that life of the unthinking which is full of frivolity and of glitter and which goes on to the menace or destruction of the home."

Cloth, $2.00

OTHER NOTABLE FICTION

Torchlight

By BARONESS LEONIE AMINOFF

"'Torchlight' is a book all of whose characters are historic persons, written with the realism of a particularly veracious historian. . . historic novels usually sacrifice either art to history, or fact to form. 'Torchlight' triumphs without sacrifice or compromise. It is rather miraculous . . . a novel in the fullest sense of the word."—*The Argonaut*, San Francisco.

Price, $2.00

A Chair on the Boulevard

By LEONARD MERRICK

Twenty little masterpieces, of which the *Boston Herald* says:—"Each has the distinctive sparkle that the wit and wisdom of Mr. Merrick enables him to give his characterizations, and most of them have the amazingly unexpected development at the end which leaves the reader startled and chuckling. Some of the most exquisitly amusing yarns in the literature of our times are in this collection."

Uniform with **"Conrad in Quest of his Youth," "The Man Who Understood Women," "The Worldlings,"** etc.

Each $1.90

THERE ARE TWO BOOKS WHICH YOU SHOULD READ BEFORE THE NOVEMBER CONFERENCE

"The Next War"

By WILL IRWIN

"A little book upon the biggest subject now before the world. It ought to be widely read, universally read."
—*Atlantic Monthly*. $1.50

Balkanized Europe

By PAUL SCOTT MOWRER

The best book yet written on those little countries of central Europe in which lies the menace of war; it is also an explanation of Europe's failure to understand the United States. $5.00

These books can be bought in any bookshop or from

E. P. DUTTON & CO., 681 Fifth Ave., New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Publishers of

ROMAIN ROLLAND'S

New Book

"CLERAMBAULT"

ask you to read these quotations:

CHICAGO TRIBUNE—"May it be translated into every tongue and may its great message sink into the hearts and become a part of the convictions of men everywhere."

THE NATION—"A time will come when men will marvel that any brain could have been so clear as to write this book between the years 1916 and 1920; as I turn the pages, I cannot but think of the prophet on the mountain."

SAN FRANCISCO CALL—"Henry Holt has performed his highest duty as a publisher in printing Clarambault."

NEW YORK SUN—"It is, without doubt, a moving book, and will not be without effect on current thought."

NEW YORK TRIBUNE—"The world is moving towards his main position."

At all Booksellers, $2.00

HENRY HOLT & COMPANY, NEW YORK

THE mere announcement of a volume of essays by the late

WALTER WEYL

will be sufficient to arouse the interest of the readers of this magazine.

TIRED RADICALS

AND OTHER PAPERS

contains noteworthy articles that appeared in this paper, some that were first printed in *Asia, Harper's* and elsewhere, and others that are now presented for the first time.

Obtainable at bookstores or of the publisher for $2.00

B. W. HUEBSCH, INC., 116 W. 13th street, NEW YORK

The Children's School

For boys and girls from 2 to 12 years

The aim of the school is to prepare each child for a complete life, both as an individual and as a member of the social group. All-day activities make best use of advantages of city life. Hot lunches served. Afternoon trips in connection with school work. Athletic field; swimming; large roof playground; carpentry shop; auditorium for music and dancing; outdoor nature study; art and Indian craft work. Particular attention to spoken French and Science. *Write for booklet.*

MARGARET NAUMBURG, Director

32-34 W. 68th Street New York City

NOTICE An error was made in a previous advertisement in giving the address of WESTERN VIEW FARM as Milford, Conn., instead of *New* Milford, Conn.

WESTERN VIEW FARM in the Berkshire Foothills; a retreat 900 feet high among rolling hills and winding roads; a modernized and roomy structure in surroundings which are ideal for rest, recuperation and creative activity. The occupancy is limited to ten visitors and the rates are $35 a week. Open April 1st to December 1st. Autumn is a particularly lovely time in the Berkshires. Mr. and Mrs. Edward G. Ohmer, New Milford, Conn.

HILLSIDE A SCHOOL FOR GIRLS

Norwalk, Connecticut

College preparatory and special courses. Normal living in right environment. Every comfort. All healthful activities. Gymnasium. Catalog.

Margaret R. Brendlinger, A.B., Vassar
Vida Hunt Francis, A.B. Smith
Principals

Brentano's
NEW YORK
5th Ave at 27th St
Booksellers to the World
Mail Telephone Cable Telegraph
ALL BOOKS
ALL LANGUAGES

THE TYRANNY OF GOD

By JOSEPH LEWIS

The newest, most daring, thought-producing book of the year. It answers with undaunted courage the greatest question of life—*Where did we come from?—What are we doing here?—Whither are we going?*

Clarence S. Darrow, the eminent attorney, says: "It is bold and true, beyond dispute."

Rational Living: "A fine little book, worth reading by everyone. It will stimulate correct thinking."

The ONE book you MUST read!

Price only $1.00 Postpaid.

TRUTH PUB. CO., Dept. 15-TG, 1400 Bway, N.Y.

BOB-WHITE

For boys under 15. Seventh season. Horseback riding through woodland trails, tennis tournaments, athletic fields, camping trips, boating, etc. Illustrated booklet.

R. C. HILL. S. B. HAYES, Ashland, Mass.

DR. WILL DURANT will lecture at *Labor Temple*, 14th St. & 2d Ave., N.Y.C., Sundays at 5 p. m., beginning Sept. 11, on *European Literature in the Nineteenth Century;* and Wednesdays at 8.30 p. m., beginning Sept. 14, on *A Survey of Contemporary Psychology.* Send for syllabus of these courses, and prospectus of the new Labor Temple School.

A YOUNG MAN, graduate of Columbia with high honors, member of Phi Beta Kappa, desires position while doing graduate work. Free daily before 3 P. M. and after 6 P. M. Address Box 116, The New Republic, 421 West 21st Street.

BUREAU OF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION. Founded to further human relations in industry. Educational Division—One Year Cooperative Course, Eight weeks Intensive Course, Evening Courses. Labor Analysis Division. Placement Division. 17 West 47th Street, New York City.

FURNISHED COTTAGES

for light housekeeping. Rainy Lake, an unspoiled wilderness. Land of moose and primitive Indians. Address Deer Island, Ranier, Minn.

THE SCHOOL OF DOMESTIC ARCHITECTURE AND LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE FOR WOMEN

Summer and winter terms. Limited registration

4 Brattle Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED